A8671-1F 10/87

MOVING FORWARD:

A NATIONAL AGENDA TO ADDRESS HOMELESSNESS IN 1990 AND BEYOND

AND

A STATUS REPORT ON HOMELESSNESS IN AMERICA

A 46-CITY SURVEY, 1988-89

SEPTEMBER, 1989

THE PARTNERSHIP FOR THE HOMELESS, INC.
115 WEST 31 STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10001-2109

INDEX

Preface v

THE NATIONAL SURVEY REPORT

I. Survey Background and Methodology .....pp..1-3

II. Major Survey Findings 4-30
(Tables I through VI)

III. Comparisons and Conclusions 31-43

THE NATIONAL AGENDA TO ADDRESS HOMELESSNESS IN 1990 AND BEYOND

A. Correcting the Income Imbalance 46-50

B. Increasing Opportunities for Employment and Self-Sufficiency 50-59

C. Reducing the Affordable Housing Gap for Low-Income Households 59-68

D. Expanding the Effectiveness of the McKinney Act 69-76

E. Implementing Welfare Reform 76-81

F. Developing a Comprehensive Plan to Provide Supportive Housing for Homeless People with AIDS 81-85

G. Cost Considerations: Funding the Agenda Fairly .85-91
(Table VII)

APPENDIX A: Notes and Sources 92-94

APPENDIX B: Survey Questionnaire.....95-110

APPENDIX C: Table of Unaffordable Market Rents.....111-119

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Partnership is most grateful to the survey participants from hundreds of public and private agencies in the 46 cities and localities surveyed for their valuable time and cooperation in making this report possible. We also thank Fred Doolittle of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation for Providing important resource materials, and Leonard R. Harris, our Board vice-chair, for his invaluable guidance and editing.

We are particularly grateful to Michael Grumet for coordinating the survey and his assistance in completing this report. The report was written by Peter P. Smith.

The artist for the cover is James McGhee, a formerly homeless person who now works with The Partnership For The Homeless.

PREFACE

After a decade that has experienced increases in homelessness beyond any level since the Great Depression, the principal theme of this report, Moving Forward, might suggest unrealistic optimism.

So too, the proposed National Agenda to Address Homelessness in 1990 and Beyond--which comprises the second half of this document and to which its title refers--may also sound overly ambitious in the context of a decade marked by largely uncoordinated and ineffective efforts to respond to the rapid growth or the root causes of homelessness. Indeed, as unusual as it may seem, we know of no other recent attempt to put forward a serious national strategy to address this complex socio-economic problem, despite the fact that it has become one of national dimensions. Although local approaches, regional plans,and piecemeal reactions to particular contributing causes of homelessness such as affordable housing and welfare reform have not been lacking, particularly in recent years, no comprehensive national strategy has as yet emerged to address what our survey and others show to be clearly a national disgrace.

We have been prompted to put forward this modest agenda at the dawn of a new decade by several developments. First, public

opinion has now coalesced to the point where most Americans have made it clear that they want serious action taken to abate this ever-expanding problem. Survey after survey have shown that the majority are now concerned enough to be willing to pay additional taxes for programs that will effectively address homelessness. Second, Congress has begun to hear that message, and has started to move on several fronts, such as lack of affordable housing, welfare reform, employment training restructuring, child care initiatives, and raising minimum income levels. Congressional response has been generally positive, yet it must be said that most such efforts are yet in their nascent and underfunded stages, or have even been temporarily thwarted--e.g., raising the minimum wage, universal health care, and drug treatment on demand. Finally, we have learned much during the past decade at the state and local levels about approaches which work and those which do not work--valuable lessons obtained in the crucible of "hands on" experience that are now ripened for application on a national level.

Many of the building blocks necessary to fashion a truly national approach to addressing homelessness have now been shaped, presenting what may be a watershed opportunity that we dare not pass by despite its risks and obstacles. In seeking to meet this challenge, we have drawn from the not insignificant reservoir of recent reports, studies and surveys (including our current one) examining the various efforts to address growing

homelessness, some concepts of which are embodied in legislation now being considered by Congress and the Administration.

In proposing this National Agenda, we harbor no delusion that the ravages of a decade-long expansion of homelessness can be reversed overnight, or even in one year. To the contrary: The manifestations of our failed national policies will continue to be with us for some time, even as we begin and persevere in the task of rooting out causes of both homelessness and poverty. The obstacles, moreover, are formidable; while homelessness is in a very real sense itself a manifestation of deepening poverty, a full attack on all the causes of poverty is well beyond the purview and focus of this proposal. The overriding necessity of measured but serious deficit reduction extending well into the decade also poses a difficult challenge for much of what we propose, although we have taken considerable care to reconcile this constraining but important interest with the initiatives we have suggested.

This National Agenda is not meant to be a rigid plan with fixed time-tables and specific measurable outcomes. Rather it is designed more as a blueprint--a roadmap for the 1990's, if you will--as to how we should start and where we should be going into the next decade in arresting and even eliminating the continued onslaught of homelessness. What we have done is to pull together these threads, and attempted to weave them into a cohesive fabric

that includes additional initiatives and suggested improvements, all within what we perceive to be the confines of realistic budget reduction limitations.

In offering an agenda so fashioned, we are not unmindful of the risks involved. The ideal plan would go much farther and more swiftly than the one we propose. But it would rapidly be discarded as unachievable in this season of scarce resources. Several of the suggestions put forward in the Agenda, particularly for 1990, could be seriously skewed by Congress or by the Administration (or by both) for political or budgetary considerations, thereby slowing or even altering the course of the Agenda. For example, the fate of the proposed National Affordable Housing Act, which embodies several new and promising approaches to the federal role in reducing the lack of affordable housing, is very much in the balance even as we issue this Agenda. Whatever its fate in this or the next session of Congress, however, its imaginative concepts should be pursued in some form. We have attempted to design the Agenda to accommodate such flexibility.

While our political leadership may perhaps stray in some respects from the roadmap we have suggested, we believe its course and concepts to be essentially valid and useful in the longer term effort that most Americans now say (in a fairly loud voice) they want our political leaders to work to achieve.

Moreover, they want it achieved on a priority basis--budget reductions and even increased taxes notwithstanding. If we are to hope to prevent the American dream from becoming a nightmare for so many more, the challenge can no longer be ignored.

The first part of this document is a report on our national survey on homelessness, covering 1988 and the first third of 1989. The largely disappointing findings it presents serve further to emphasize the necessity of moving forward with a comprehensive national agenda for the 1990s.

Peter P. Smith
President

The Partnership For The Homeless

I. SURVEY BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY.

This is the fifth national survey report issued by The Partnership For The Homeless relating primarily to the growth and trends in addressing homelessness over most of the last five years.* These reports have been based upon survey questionnaires circulated to hundreds of public and private agencies involved in addressing poverty and homelessness and their causes in from forty-two to sixty of the nation's largest cities and localities. As such, these reports have consistently been based upon the most comprehensive sampling of any national survey published since the precipitous increases in the homeless began about a decade ago.

This report is based upon a similarly broad participation in our most recent survey which covered 1988 and the first four months of 1989. Over five hundred public and private agencies in 46 cities and localities took part in the survey. In most cases, survey questionnaires were sent to at least one public and one private sector agency in each city or locality. On average, questionnaires were circulated to nine or more agencies in the larger cities and localities, either directly or through a local coordinating agency or umbrella organization.

*National Trends In Addressing Homelessness, The Partnership For The Homeless, 1/15/86; National Growth In Homeless: Winter 1986 And Beyond, The Partnership For The Homeless, 5/21/86; National Growth in Homelessness: Winter 1987, Broken Promises/Broken Lives, The Partnership For The Homeless, March 1987; National Funding To Assist The Homeless, The Partnership For The Homeless, 12/15/87.

Survey interviews were also used, particularly where incomplete information or wide discrepancies were reported. In addition, a variety of recently-issued reports from cities and localities, as well as data compiled from the Partnership's National Technical Assistance Program were utilized in cross-checking and reconciling conflicting information received from reporting agencies in the same city or locality. Finally, follow-up interviews were conducted into June, 1989 with agencies in almost every city and locality to update the status of estimates and information provided in the survey returns.

This year's survey questionnaire particularly focused on the percentage of homeless in each city or locality impaired by the disabilities of severe mental illness and drug and/or alcohol dependency. This information is further broken down by major category, i.e., single men, single women, family members, and unaccompanied youth. Our purpose is to provide as accurate a reference point as possible with respect to these homeless subgroups, particularly since the media has recently published widely varying estimates on the extent of these impairments among the homeless. At the same time the survey results provide information on the extent and adequacy of services provided for these special needs homeless.

The survey questionnaire contains a special section designed to provide the first national glimpse of the emerging problem of

growing homelessness among people living with AIDS and related illnesses. A copy of the survey questionnaire is provided as Appendix B to this report. Also examined separately are the chronic or hard-core homeless (sometimes referred to as "street people") and the growing phenomenon of street solicitation ("pan handling"), as well as the approaches and attitudes of the survey participants towards that activity. Finally, the survey provides an assessment of the impact of the programs and funding provided under the federal Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, and the participants' comments and recommendations for improvements.

As in prior survey reports, we have made no attempt to estimate the precise number of people currently homeless in the nation. The most recent estimates differ widely, varying from 600,000 by a research institute, to 3 million by an advocacy group. The absence of scientifically valid methodology for accurately capturing the number of homeless in those estimates, however, only serves to emphasize the futility and lack of usefulness of such exercises; homelessness is, almost by definition, perhaps impossible to measure precisely. Most attempts at estimating the homeless by cities and localities have concluded that the homeless comprise from .7 to 1.1 percent of their respective populations. If this range is reasonably accurate, there may be as many as 2 million homeless across the nation.

II. MAJOR SURVEY FINDINGS.

A. Homelessness in America Has Continued To Increase Substantially through 1988-89.

o The number of homeless across the forty-six survey cities and localities increased by an average of 18 percent during the period surveyed. Please refer to Table I, "Increase In Homelessness, 1988-89."

o The highest increases were reported in Everett, Washington (70%), Salt Lake City (67%), Newark (60%), and Wichita (50%). No city or locality found a decrease in the number of homeless, and only in Corpus Cristi, Seattle, and Wilmington were no increases reported.

o Thirty-nine of the survey cities and localities recorded a substantial or moderate increase in the number of homeless employed either fully or part-time.

o The "hidden homeless" also increased in all but one survey city (St. Paul). These are mostly families with children who are living either doubled or tripled up with other families, typically in substandard and/or over-crowded housing.

o A substantial majority of cities and localities (71%) also experienced an increase in the number of hard-core or chronic homeless. Sometimes referred to as "street people", these are mostly individual homeless who have adjusted their lifestyles to living alternately in various shelters and the streets/public places, and who generally resist or reject available services and efforts to provide employment, permanent housing and other assistance designed to help escape the cycle of homelessness.

o Slightly less than 6 percent of the homeless in all survey cities and localities were found to have become or remain homeless by their choice--down from 7.3% in 1987.

TABLE I

INCREASE IN HOMELESSNESS, 1988 - 1989

Atlanta, GA	15%
Austin, TX	3%
Baltimore, MD	10.5%
Berkeley, CA	24.2%
Boston, MA	25%
Chicago, IL	13.6%
Cleveland, OH	23%
Columbus,OH	17%
Corpus Christi, TX	0%
Dallas, TX	34.6%
Denver, CO	7%
Des Moines, IO	15%
East St. Louis, IL	.7%
El Paso, TX	28%
Everett, WA	70%
Hartford, CT	25%
Hiawatha, KS	20%
Indianapolis, IN	5.6%
Kansas City, MO	14%
Los Angeles, CA	25%
Louisville, KY	3.5%
Manhattan, KS	15%
Miami, FL	20%
Nashville, TN	23%
New Orleans, LA	15%
New York, NY	7%
Newark, NJ	60%
Oakland, CA	11%
Park Forest, IL	10%
Philadelphia, PA	7.5%
Phoenix, AZ	4%
Portland, OR	19%
Portsmouth, NH	8%
Providence, RI	7%
Richmond, VA	10%
St. Paul, MN	5%
Salt Lake City, UT	67%
San Antonio, TX	10%
San Diego, CA	18%
San Francisco, CA	10%
Seattle, WA	0%
Tucson, AZ	5%
Vernon, CT	10%
Washington, DC	21%
Wichita, KS	50%
Wilmington, DE	0%
TOTAL	18%

B. The Increase In Homelessness Among Families Has Leveled Off: Single Males Comprise By Far The Largest Portion of The Homeless.

o Across all survey cities and localities, single adult males comprise almost one half of the homeless, at 47.4 percent.

o Homelessness among families with children, while continuing to increase somewhat, appears to have leveled at 31 percent of the homeless as of April, 1989 -- in contrast to 1985 and into the first part of 1988, when extraordinary increases in family homelessness were reported throughout the country.

o In 39 of the 46 cities and localities surveyed, single adult males were the largest portion of the homeless population. The highest percentages of single homeless men were reported in Richmond, Virginia (74%), Tucson (68%), Dallas (68%), Hartford, Connecticut (67%), San Francisco (63%), Salt Lake City (62%), Austin (62%) and Nashville (59.4%).

o In the remaining seven survey cities and localities, members of families with children comprised the largest segment of the homeless population. Among those cities in this category were El Paso (64%), East St. Louis, Illinois (57%), Newark (49%), and Wilmington (48%).

o Single women make up 15.9% of the homeless, lead by Atlanta (30%) and Des Moines (28%).

o Unaccompanied youth have now increased to 5.9% of the total homeless, with the largest percentage being reported in New York City (18%), Park Forest, Illinois (15%), and San Antonio (12.5%).

o Please refer to Table II, "Homeless Population Composition, 1988-89."

TABLE II

HOMELESS POPULATION COMPOSITION, 1988-1989

	MEN	WOMEN	FAMILIES	YOUTH
Atlanta, GA	53%	30%	15%	2%
Austin, TX	62%	15%	18%	5%
Baltimore, MD	39%	23%	26%	12%
Berkeley, CA	54%	17%	20%	9%
Boston, MA	55%	14%	24%	7%
Chicago, IL	39%	19%	37%	5%
Cleveland, OH	48%	13%	35%	4%
Columbus,OH	53%	18%	26%	3%
Corpus Christi, TX	40%	25%	30%	5%
Dallas, TX	68%	12%	15%	5%
Denver, CO	39%	19%	32%	10%
Des Moines, IO	40%	28%	22%	10%
Detroit, MI	33%	13%	48%	6%
East St. Louis, IL	20%	9%	57%	10%
El Paso, TX	24%	10%	64%	2%
Everett, WA	37%	7.7%	55%	.3%
Hartford, CT	67%	18%	15%	1%
Hiawatha, KS	58%	15%	24%	3%
Indianapolis, IN	40%	20%	30%	10%
Kansas City, MO	39%	21%	37%	3%
Los Angeles, CA	40%	15%	35%	10%
Louisville, KY	58%	9%	30%	3%
Manhattan, KS	52%	12%	36%	.05%
Miami, FL	40%	20%	35%	5%
Nashville, TN	59.4%	14.8%	23.4%	2.4%
New Orleans, LO	52%	22%	16%	10%
New York, NY	39%	6%	37%	18%
Newark, NJ	31%	16%	49%	4%
Oakland, CA	19%	25%	55%	1%
Park Forest, IL	30%	25%	30%	15%
Philadelphia, PA	52%	14%	32%	2%
Phoenix, AZ	62%	12%	23%	3%
Portsmouth, NH	43%	22%	34%	1%
Portland, OR	43%	17%	28%	12%
Providence, RI	37%	21%	31%	11%
Richmond, VA	74%	8%	17%	1%
St. Paul, MN	61%	14.7%	22.5%	1.8%
Salt Lake City, UT	62%	9%	27%	2%
San Antonio, TX	47%	7.5%	33%	12.5%
San Diego, CA	50%	15%	30%	5%
San Francisco, CA	63%	16%	15%	6%
Seattle, WA	52.6%	14.1%	30.7%	2.6%
Tucson, AZ	68%	9%	18%	5%
Vernon, CT	35%	15%	47%	3%
Washington, DC	36%	20%	34%	10%
Wilmington, DE	24%	18%	48%	10%
Wichita, KS	54%	15%	28%	2%
TOTALS	47%	16%	31%	6%

C. A Substantial Portion of The Homeless Population, Particularly Single Adults, Are Impaired By Severe Mental Illness and Substance Dependencies: There Are Few Services Available To Meet Their Needs.

(1) Severe Mental Illness

o An average of 21 percent of all homeless in the cities and localities surveyed are impaired by severe mental illness. The percentage of the homeless so impaired is the highest in Corpus Christi (36%), Boston (34.4%), Oakland (34%), Berkeley, California (33%), Hartford (31.6%), and Denver (30.4%). Please refer to Table III, "Homeless Impaired By Severe Mental Illness.

o Single adult females (28%) and males (25%), comprise by far the largest portion of this group.

o Severe mental illness is far less prevalent among members of homeless families (10%) and unaccompanied youths (11%).

o In 42 of the 46 reporting cities and localities (91%), mental health care programs and facilities, particularly transitional housing programs for the mentally ill, are not sufficient to meet the needs of the homeless. Only in Austin, Des Moines, Indianapolis, and Park Forest, Illinois do survey participants report that such programs are sufficiently available to meet the need.

o The survey participants ranked the mentally ill homeless among the top three groups for whom emergency shelter, transitional accommodations and other needed services are most lacking.

TABLE III
HOMELESS IMPAIRED BY SEVERE MENTAL ILLNESS
(1988-89)

	MEN	WOMEN	FAMILIES	YOUTH	TOTAL
Atlanta, GA	15%	5%	5%	NA	10.6%
Austin, TX	40%	20	10%	NA	29.6%
Baltimore, MD	NA	NA	NA	NA	26%
Berkeley, CA	40%	30%	15%	NA	33%
Boston, MA	20%	50%	NA	NA	34.4%
Chicago, IL	24%	30%	5%	10%	17.5%
Cleveland, OH	40%	45%	10%	7%	27%
Columbus, OH	25%	35%	10%	20%	22.8%
Corpus Christi, TX	NA	NA	NA	NA	36%
Dallas, TX	31%	33%	10%	15%	27.8%
Denver, CO	45%	40%	10%	20%	30.4%
Des Moines, IO	42%	30%	10%	10%	28.4%
East St. Louis, IL	6%	5%	2%	3%	2.7%
El Paso, TX	15%	5%	10%	5%	10.4%
Everett, WA	10%	25%	10%	20%	11.2%
Hartford, CT	35%	45%	NA	NA	31.6%
Hiawatha, KS	30%	30%	10%	20%	24.9%
Indianapolis, IN	23%	20%	5%	5%	15.2%
Kansas City, MO	NA	NA	NA	NA	28.3%
Los Angeles, CA	25%	30%	12%	18%	20.6%
Louisville, KY	27%	35%	10%	14%	22.1%
Manhattan, KS	2%	.5%	3%	NA	2.2%
Miami, FL	25%	20%	5%	12%	16.4%
Nashville, TN	33%	42%	15%	10%	30.2%
New Orleans, LO	25%	5%	20%	3%	23.8%
New York, NY	28%	34%	12%	8%	19.1%
Newark, NJ	29%	26%	6%	NA	16.1%
Oakland, CA	NA	NA	NA	NA	34%
Park Forest, IL	15%	15%	3%	5%	10.7%
Philadelphia, PA	5%	5%	5%	NA	18.3%
Phoenix, AZ	23%	33%	12%	7%	21.3%
Portland, OR	30%	20%	16%	10%	15.4%
Portsmouth, NH	25%	30%	15%	2%	22.5%
Providence, RI	18%	23%	10%	16%	16.4%
Richmond, VA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
St. Paul, MN	26%	37%	NA	NA	21.3%
Salt Lake City, UT	16%	60%	5%	NA	16.6%
San Antonio, TX	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
San Diego, CA	25%	38%	17%	16%	24.2%
San Francisco, CA	25%	40%	20%	15%	26.1%
Seattle, WA	30%	35%	20%	10%	27.2%
Tucson, AZ	17%	23%	7%	7%	15.3%
Vernon, CT	2%	5%	1%	NA	2.1%
Washington, DC	30%	40%	20%	10%	26.6%
Wichita, KS	30%	40%	10%	5%	25.1%
Wilmington, DE	28%	32%	10%	5%	17.7%
TOTALS	25%	28%	10%	11%	21%

* Survey participants from Boston, Hartford and St. Paul were unable to estimate the percentage of homeless family members and unaccompanied youth impaired by severe mental illness.

** Survey participants from Atlanta, Austin, Berkeley, Manhattan (Kanasas), Philadelphia, Newark, Salt Lake City and Vernon Connecticut) were unable to estimate the percentage of homeless unaccompanied youth impaired by severe mental illness.

(2) Drug and Alcohol Dependency

o An average of 31 percent of all homeless in the participating cities and localities are impaired by drug and/or alcohol dependencies. The highest percentages of the homeless so impaired were reported in Atlanta (49.8%), Everett, Washington (43.7%), Providence (43.2%), Hartford (43.2%), Wichita (42.7%), Louisville (40.2%), and Tucson (40.2%). Please refer to Table IV, "Homeless Impaired By Drug/Alcohol Dependency."

o Once again, single adults comprise the highest portion of this group, with a larger percentage of males impaired (42%) than females (26%).

o While the percentage of substance dependent homeless family members is still relatively low (17%), the problem among homeless youths is now substantial (25%).

o Ninety-three percent of participating cities and localities (43 of 46) report that drug rehabilitation programs are insufficient to meet the needs of the homeless. Only participants from Austin, Des Moines, and Colorado Springs found such services available at adequate levels.

Note: The percentages of homeless impaired by mental illness and those impaired by drug and/or alcohol dependencies are not cumulative. While most of the survey participants were unable to provide the percentage of overlap with any degree of certainty, estimates ranged from 20 to 60 percent.

TABLE IV

HOMELESS IMPAIRED BY DRUGS AND/OR ALCOHOL DEPENDENCY

(1988-89)

	MEN	WOMEN	FAMILIES	YOUTH	TOTAL
Atlanta, GA	66%	40%	10%	NA	49.8%
Austin, TX	40%	20%	10%	15%	30.4%
Baltimore, MD	NA	NA	NA	NA	34%
Berkeley, CA	43%	20%	30%	20%	33.8%
Boston, MA	45%	18%	12%	18%	31.5%
Chicago, IL	40%	30%	20%	32%	30.3%
Cleveland, OH	47%	40%	15%	30%	33.9%
Columbus,OH	30%	30%	15%	30%	26.1%
Corpus Christi, TX	NA	NA	NA	NA	30%
Dallas, TX	35%	33%	10%	20%	30.3%
Denver, CO	45%	35%	20%	30%	33.6%
Des Moines, IO	51%	20%	10%	30%	31.2%
East St. Louis, IL	10%	8%	2%	3%	3.7%
El Paso, TX	40%	15%	25%	10%	27.3%
Everett, WA	55%	30%	40%	50%	43.7%
Hartford, CT	54%	39%	NA	NA	43.2%
Hiawatha, KS	58%	10%	20%	4%	40%
Indianapolis, IN	30%	25%	10%	30%	23%
Kansas City, MO	30%	20%	10%	20%	20.2%
Los Angeles, CA	25%	NA	NA	NA	34.7%
Louisville, KY	68%	25%	30%	2%	40.2%
Manhattan, KS	35%	10%	10%	NA	23%
Miami, FL	62%	16%	10%	20%	32.5%
Nashville, TN	42%	31%	25%	20%	35.7%
New Orleans, LO	37%	18%	20%	17%	24%
New York, NY	39%	28%	23%	26%	30.3%
Newark, NJ	37%	32%	30%	NA	34.5%
Oakland, CA	NA	NA	NA	NA	34%
Park Forest, IL	40%	30%	25%	47%	34%
Philadelphia, PA	40%	28%	20%	12%	31.7%
Phoenix, AZ	28%	17%	12%	15%	22.6%
Portland, OR	38%	23%	12%	60%	30.6%
Portsmouth, NH	45%	40%	30%	NA	38.4%
Providence, RI	NA	NA	NA	NA	43.2%
St. Paul, MN	39%	25%	NA	NA	30.9%
Salt Lake City, UT	30%	10%	10%	NA	23.4%
San Antonio, TX	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
San Diego, CA	30%	30%	15%	62%	27.1%
San Francisco, CA	50%	25%	NA	NA	27.7%
Seattle, WA	46%	30%	15%	50%	32.9%
Tucson, AZ	45%	30%	25%	22%	40.2%
Vernon, CT	30%	30%	2%	-	15.9%
Washington, DC	48%	28%	27%	NA	32.1%
Wichita, KS	60%	20%	20%	25%	42.7%
Wilmington, DE	58%	39%	10%	5%	26.2%
TOTALS	42%	26%	17%	25%	31%

* Total percentages for Hartford, San Francisco, and St. Paul do not include estimates of percentage of homeless family members and unaccompanied youth impaired by drug and alcohol dependency. Total percentage for Los Angeles includes only the percentage of homeless single adult males so impaired. Total perecentages from Atlanta, Manhattan (Kansas), Newark, Portsmouth (New Hampshire), Salt Lake City and Washington, D.C. do not include estimates of the percentage of homeless unaccompanied youth impaired by drug and/or alcohol dependency.

D. While Shelter Capacity And Other Services Available To The Homeless Expanded, That Expansion Was Far Exceeded By The Increase In Need.

o The number of emergency and transitional shelter beds (including temporary placements in hotels, motels, and rooming houses) increased in 30 of the survey cities and localities, remained about the same in 16, and decreased in none during the period surveyed.

o Emergency and transitional bed capacity increased by an average of 14.5 percent across all survey cities and localities, and by an average of 22.2 percent in those thirty which experienced an increase.

o Notwithstanding this substantial increase in available emergency and transitional shelter beds, however, the percentage of homeless whose need for shelter and services was unmet grew to an average of 37 percent in all reporting cities and localities. The percentage of unmet need ranged from highs in Dallas (90%), Tucson (81%), Chicago (80%) Seattle (64%), Corpus Christi (60%), Wilmington (57%), and Atlanta (55%), to lows in Des Moines (5%), El Paso (5%), St. Paul (5%), East St. Louis (10%), Kansas City (10%), and Manhattan, Kansas (none). Please refer to Table V, "Emergency/Transitional Shelter Capacity And Unmet Need For Same, 1988-89."

o In all survey cities and localities except three (Wichita, Salt Lake City, and Manhattan, Kansas), homeless were turned away from shelters and transitional accommodations (hotels, motels, rooming houses and SRO's) because of unavailability of beds, space or program resources and restrictions.

o The unmet need was the largest among homeless families with children, and the survey participants ranked single parent families as the group for which emergency and transitional shelter and services is most lacking, with the unemployed, mentally ill, and substance dependent homeless following in that order.

o While many services other than emergency/transitional shelter are now available to the homeless, few are provided at levels sufficient to meet the need. Leading the list of services either not available or provided at less than adequate levels to the homeless are: permanent housing assistance, drug rehabilitation, job training, mental health care, and child daycare. Services most available at adequate levels are health/medical care and case management. Please refer to Table VI, " Services Available To Homeless."

TABLE V

EMERGENCY/TRANSITIONAL SHELTER CAPACITY AND UNMET NEED FOR SAME
1988-89

City/Locality	Shelter Capacity Increase (Decrease)	Unmet Need	Turnaways Yes (No)
Atlanta, GA	10%	55%	Y
Austin, TX	*	14%	Y/N
Baltimore, MD	50%	52%	Y
Berkeley, CA	30%	50%	Y
Boston, MA	25%	14%	Y
Chicago, IL	25%	80%	Y
Cleveland, OH	*	30%	Y
Columbus, OH	10%	50%	Y
Corpus Christi, TX	5%	60%	Y
Dallas, TX	100%	90%	Y
Denver, CO	*	28%	Y
Des Moines, IO	*	5%	Y
East St. Louis, IL	15%	10%	Y
El Paso, TX	*	5%	Y
Everett, WA	*	50%	Y
Hartford, CT	*	28%	Y
Hiawatha, KS	*	10%	Y
Indianapolis, IN	30%	18%	Y
Kansas City, MO	*	10%	Y
Los Angeles, CA	20%	40%	Y
Louisville, KY	30%	20%	Y
Manhattan, KS	*	0	N
Miami, FL	*	18%	Y
Nashville, TN	5%	40%	Y
New Orleans, LO	10%	50%	Y
New York, NY	8%	52%	Y
Newark, NJ	15%	56%	Y
Oakland, CA	13.5%	50%	Y
Park Forest, IL	*	40%	Y
Philadelphia, PA	12.5%	16%	Y
Phoenix, AZ	5%	52.5%	Y
Portland, OR	10%	47.5%	Y
Portsmouth, NH	15%	12%	Y
Providence, RI	*	50%	Y
Richmond, VA	5	40%	Y
St. Paul, MN	*	5%	Y
Salt Lake City, UT	*	50%	N
San Antonio, TX	18.4%	25%	Y
San Diego, CA	10%	52%	Y
San Francisco, CA	5%	53%	Y
Seattle, WA	20%	64%	Y
Tucson, AZ	20%	81%	Y
Vernon, CT	*	12%	Y
Washington, DC	50%	28%	Y
Wichita, KS	20%	32%	N
Wilmington, DE	75%	57%	Y
TOTALS	**14.5%**	**37%**	

* Shelter capacity stayed at about the same level.

TABLE VI

SERVICES AVAILABLE TO HOMELESS (1988-89)

Service	Available To Homeless	Sufficient to Meet Need
Day Centers (Singles) Including Mentally Ill	73%	13%
Day Centers (Families)	45%	14%
Child Day-Care	47%	26%
Health Care	93%	30%
Mental Health Care	95%	14%
Case Management	89%	23%
Transitional Housing Mentally Ill	51%	9%
Transitional Housing Families	74%	13%
Housing Assistance	85%	9%
Job Training	85%	9%
Drug Rehab Programs	92%	0%
Counseling	95%	11%

E. Although The Principal Cause of Homelessness Continues To Be Lack of Affordable Housing, Unemployment and Underemployment Are Now Very Close Behind.

o Sixty percent of the survey participants designated the lack of decent and affordable housing for low-income households as the principal cause of homelessness in their city or locality.

o With few exceptions, all of the remaining survey cities and localities cite unemployment and/or underemployment, including inadequate minimum and other wage levels, as the primary cause of homelessness. In fact, using weighted averages (based upon top three rankings by each survey participant), unemployment/underemployment finishes in almost a dead heat with lack of affordable housing, as the leading cause of homelessness in America.

o Also ranked high among the causes of homelessness by many survey participants were (in descending order) substance dependencies, public assistance deficiencies, lack of education and/or job skills, domestic violence and/or family disintegration, mental illness, AIDS and related illnesses, and evictions by landlords and primary tenants.

F. While Half Of The Survey Cities Project Some Increase In Emergency/Transitional Shelter, The Vast Majority Expect A Larger Increase In The Number Of Unsheltered Homeless.

o Almost 80 percent of the survey cities and localities anticipate a continued increase in the number of homeless through the balance of the current year; about 20 percent project no substantial change, and none anticipate a decrease.

o About one-half of the survey participants expect available emergency shelter and transitional accommodations in their city or locality to experience a slight to moderate increase this year. Only Philadelphia anticipates a decrease, and the remainder project no substantial change.

o An overwhelming majority (87%) anticipate either a moderate (61%) or substantial (26%) increase in the number of homeless who cannot be provided either emergency shelter or transitional accommodations on any particular night this year; none anticipate that this number will decrease, and only 16 percent expect the number who will be turned away to remain at current levels.

G. The Shortage of Affordable, Low-Income Housing Continued and Will Continue To Increase Despite Expanded Local Efforts, Unless The Federal Government Provides Substantial Assistance.

o Every city and locality participating in the survey reported a shortage of affordable housing for low income households, and an overwhelming 92 percent found this to be a major cause of homelessness.

o In only one city (St. Paul) did this shortage decrease last year, while it increased in 83 percent. The increase, moreover, was substantial in 56 percent of those cities and localities, and moderate in 36 percent.

o The major causes of the affordable housing shortage were found to be, in descending order:

1. Lack of replacement of low-income housing lost through deterioration, fire and abandonment.
2. Curtailment of government housing production programs.
3. Rent increases.

o In a slight majority of the participating cities and localities (54%), there are now locally-designed housing programs for low-income households or firm commitments for such programs for the current year. Sixty-five percent of these programs include permanent housing for the homeless. In short, about thirty-six (36%) percent of the cities and localities surveyed

are now involved in or firmly committed to providing permanent housing specifically for the homeless.

o All but two reporting cities and localities conclude that their local initiatives can not meet the affordable housing needs of their low-income and homeless people without a substantial increase in federal funding. Over ninety (90%) percent would rather see this accomplished through new federal initiatives, such as the recently proposed "Affordable Housing Act", than by simply increasing funding under the existing Section 8 housing production programs.

o A similar overwhelming majority (84%) believe that involvement of local affiliates and/or members of national organizations representing private home builders and construction companies would contribute substantially to any private-public sector effort to address the lack of affordable low-income housing.

H. Funding Under The McKinney Act Is Beginning To Have An Impact In Providing Shelter and Services, Although Its Program Structure, Funding, And Administration Require Further Revisions.

The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, was enacted in the middle of 1987 as the federal government's principal response to growing homelessness. It now includes twenty different programs involving nine federal agencies. During the first three years, the Act's programs have been actually funded at only a $350-65 million level, although funding authorizations have been $615 and $633.8 million in 1988 and 1989, respectively.

o In about 53 percent of the cities/localities, McKinney Act funding has begun to make an important impact by expanding shelter, transitional housing, and emergency services in the 10-50% range: Thirteen of these cities and localities reported a 10-20% expansion; eight said the expansion was in the 20-30% range; and three reported an impact of 30-50%.

o In 12 cities/localities, however, McKinney Act funding has not yet had any measurable impact, and 10 other cities reported that their capacity for shelter, transitional accommodations, and other emergency services had been increased by only 5-10% through this funding.

o Survey cities and localities overwhelmingly (76%) project that the McKinney Act funding will have a greater impact in

providing additional shelter, transitional housing and emergency services by the end of this year.

o A condition of qualifying for most of the funding programs under the McKinney Act is that the state and city/locality submit a Comprehensive Homeless Assistance Plan (CHAP). Over 40 percent of cities and localities responding said that the CHAP covering their area was inadequately designed and/or structured to effectively assist the homeless. Fully half found the principal cause to be insufficient consultation with local agencies involved in assisting the homeless. Other reasons most often assigned for an inadequate CHAP submission were, in descending order:

-insufficient time allowed to submit the CHAP;

-lack of available local funding to combine or match with McKinney Act funds to properly operate certain of the programs;

-inadequate local leadership and lack of local agency capability to operate various of the programs specified under the Act;

-some restriction of churches and synagogues from using the funding provided by the Act.

o The major criticism of the Act, however, was reserved for the funding provided. Respondents from twenty-six cities and localities found that effectiveness of the programs specified

under the Act was impeded by insufficient funding levels. Respondents from twenty-two cities and localities faulted the structuring of the funding, and seventeen participants found that the structuring of the programs had a negative impact on their effectiveness.

o Ineffective administration of the Act's programs by state, county, and city agencies was cited by participants from thirteen cities and localities, with almost as many (12) criticizing administration by federal agencies.

We asked the survey participants to rate the performance of the nine federal agencies involved in the coordination and administration of the Act's programs. Those receiving the highest positive ratings were the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and the Veteran's Administration (VA), in that order (although 25% rated the later agency's performance as "poor"). Those agencies receiving the largest percentage of "poor" performance ratings were the Department of Defense (DOD), the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the Department of Labor (DOL), in that order (although 30% rated HUD performance as "good").

The survey also solicited the participants' most important recommendations to improve the effectiveness and impact of the

Act's funding and programs:

Baltimore, MD: "Increase level of funding; allow more flexibility in expenditures of funds; designate more funding to SRO development; allow more dollars for operating costs, including salaries."

Chicago,IL: "More funding for drug abuse services are desperately needed."

Columbus, OH: "Application process is too complicated without technical assistance from the federal agencies supervising the programs."

Dallas, TX: "not enough time given to prepare proposals - most of the notices are not received until 3 days to 1 week prior to due date."

Denver,CO: "More input from shelter providers in formulation of CHAP."

Des Moines, IO: "Funding should be made available to communities sooner, so that emergency needs may be met."

Indianapolis, IN: "We need additional lead-time (notification of funding) in order to get together necessary coalitions and proposals."

Los Angeles, CA: "The applications are far too complex and need to be simplified, especially for the HUD Transitional Housing Program."

Louisville, KY: "Best thing that ever happened to the homeless in Louisville."

Nashville, TN: "Allow the funding of staff costs or the hiring of new personnel at already established facilities under all the McKinney programs."

Newark, NJ: "more, much more is needed for permanent housing"

Oakland, CA: "Insufficient funding for permanent housing; haphazard way of distributing funds inhibits program effectiveness."

Phoenix, AZ: "Program regulations are often too late to be effective -- promulgate sooner."
"Remove success/result oriented basis for funding--allow for funding innovative and experimental projects to work with resistive and chronic homeless persons."

Richmond, VA: "expand definition of 'operating expenses' which

can be reimbursed by McKinney Act funds (e.g., allow payment of salaries.)"

Salt Lake City, UT: "Reduce the amount of red tape necessary to apply for programs such as HUD's Transitional Housing program."

San Antonio, TX: "The leveraging and match requirements discourage and, in some instances, prohibit eligible entities from applying for available grants. These requirements should be changed so as to allow an applicant the ability to match award amounts with more in-kind services, donations, etc."

Seattle, WA: "More funds needed for permanent low-income SRO housing and the funding for alcohol/drug abuse and mental health programs is insufficient."

Tucson, AZ: "Assure long term support and more reasonable matching requirements for programs initiated with McKinney Act funds."

"Provide more long-term commitment financing to programs, e.g., funding emergency shelter one year and not the next year despite merits of the program funded."

Washington, DC: "More McKinney dollars direct to providers with history of performance and integrity. Skip local government where dollars get skimmed and regulations get added."

Wichita, KS: "Provide local flexibility through block grants to cities with largest concentrations of homeless."

Wilmington, DE: "McKinney money enabled this shelter to provide additional support services, but no additional beds. The availability of the funds is too tentative to be effective."

I. The Rapid Growth of Homelessness Among People with AIDS Has Become a Problem of National Dimensions, with Little Supportive Housing Available or Planned to Address The Need.

o In the sixteen cities which have the largest number of AIDS cases (a combined 62%), all report that they have a substantial or moderate but increasing number of People with AIDS and related illnesses (PWAs) who are homeless, except Baltimore and Newark where the survey respondents estimate the number of PWA homeless is still small, but on the increase.

o Across all survey cities and localities, 22 percent characterized their homeless PWA population as substantial; 19 percent as moderate, and 56 percent as small. Only Vernon, Connecticut reported having no PWAs among its homeless.

o In 81 percent of the cities/localities, however, homelessness among PWAs is increasing. Similarly, 87 percent of the survey respondents anticipate that homeless PWAs will continue to increase in the coming year, and none project a decrease. In New York City, homeless PWAs are the fastest growing segment of the single adult homeless population.

o In the overwhelming majority of survey cities/localities, supportive housing and care programs for PWA homeless are either almost non-existent (64%) or insufficient (32%). Only Austin reports that there are sufficient programs and services to meet

this need. Furthermore, while 39 percent reported firm plans or commitments to establish such programs, 89 percent of those characterize such plans or commitments as insufficient--and 61 percent of all survey cities/localities report that there are no plans or commitments at all to provide appropriate supportive housing programs for this segment of the homeless population.

o Moreover, respondents from twenty-six of the cities and localities surveyed are of the opinion that negative attitudes of public officials towards the principal risk groups (homosexuals and intravenous drug users) is a factor in the lack of housing and services available, or even planned, for homeless PWAs.

o Finally, 94 percent of responding cities/localities urged that special funding be earmarked for PWA homeless housing programs and services in the major federally funded homeless programs provided under the McKinney Act.

J. Street Solicitation ("Pan Handling") Is On The Rise In Many Cities And Localities, Due Primarily To Economic Factors.

o Street Solicitation (sometimes called "pan handling") increased in forty-eight (48%) percent of the participating cities and localities and decreased in only one during the period surveyed.

o Most responding cities/localities project that street solicitation will increase (45%), or stay about the same (49%) through 1989; respondents from only two cities see this activity declining during the current year.

o The following were most often assigned by the survey participants as the principal causes of the recent increase in street solicitation:

More "working poor" and unemployment and/or underemployment	30%
Low level of benefits and/or administrative and other public assistance failures	19%
Worsening of affordable housing shortage	17%
Increase in numbers belonging to permanent underclass	17%

o About thirteen (13%) believe that one of the causes of increased street solicitation is a proliferation of "con artists". In only two cities did participants find that there was an increase in the homeless and poor who preferred

"pan handling" to working, qualifying for benefits and or using other available assistance programs. Survey respondents from two large cities emphasized increased drug use as a major cause.

o A considerable majority of those participating in the survey (70%) believe that people should use their own personal judgments in deciding how to respond to street solicitation, but that those who do give, should also encourage those soliciting to make use of available shelters and emergency services. Almost twenty-four (24%), however, feel that people should not give street solicitors money, but instead should encourage them to go to shelters, soup kitchens and other service centers.

o Only respondents from five cities/localities would counsel people not to give because many street solicitors are "con artists" or don't need the money.

III. COMPARISONS AND CONCLUSIONS

On balance, the effort to address growing homelessness in America clearly suffered another setback over 1988 and the first part of 1989. This survey again reports substantial increases in almost every significant category used to measure homelessness. It differs markedly, however, from prior surveys in several important respects.

(1) The most significant finding is clearly that the gap between the growing numbers of homeless and the emergency and transitional shelter and services they so desperately need has expanded to about 37 percent across the nation, with a full twenty of the survey cities from almost every corner of the country reporting that these basic needs are not being met for half or more of their homeless. This estimate of the service gap is a huge leap over that reported in any previous national survey on homelessness conducted since 1982, and represents almost double that estimated by the 27-city survey conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors covering November, 1987 through October 1988. To some extent, the unusual increase over prior estimates is a result of our attempt to capture a more comprehensive picture of the total unmet need for shelter and emergency assistance, rather than relying almost exclusively on recorded shelter turnaways, as in other survey efforts.

Such a massive failure to assist the most vulnerable in our supposedly progressive society is even more disturbing because it was recorded in the year when substantial funding under the federal Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act first began to have an important impact on expanding and improving shelter and emergency services. If the effects of the McKinney Act continue to increase--as most of the survey participants anticipate--it may eventually help curb and even reduce the shameful proportions of this shelter and service gap, particularly if combined with measures recommended to address the root causes of homelessness (some of which are discussed hereafter). According to projections almost unanimously reported in this survey, however, that event is not likely to occur this year, and perhaps for some time, absent a more comprehensive national agenda.

(2) An equal concern highlighted by of our survey, is the confluence of increased manifestations of poverty and homelessness, suggesting a trend towards loss of hope among many of the homeless that they have any real chance to escape the vicious cycle of homelessness. Experience teaches that without the critical component of hope, even the most effective programs will often fail at this otherwise difficult task. Several survey findings provide more than a hint of the basis for such gathering despair among the homeless:

o While the numbers of homeless impaired by severe mental illness (21%) and/or drug/alcohol dependencies (31%) have grown to large proportions, this survey shows that these are among the groups for which needed programs and services are the most lacking.

o Our survey this year also provides the first, and indeed alarming glimpse of the relatively new phenomenon of growing homelessness among people with AIDS and related illnesses. For these who have no homes in which to attempt to survive this largely terminal sickness, the news is even worse: survey returns overwhelmingly reflect that there is little available or even on the drawing boards to meet their desperate needs for supported housing and services.

o Equally dismaying is the substantial to moderate increase in the homeless who are employed reported in 85 percent of the survey cities and localities. These are mostly single adults and older youths who have some type of part-time and/or minimum wage job simply not paying enough to cover rent and such other basic needs as food, clothing and transportation. In the last decade, temporary work has grown almost nine times faster than employment as a whole, and there are now about 1.2 million temporary workers--four

times more than in 1973. Moreover, 60 percent of the new jobs created since 1979 pay less than $7,000 per year. Under these circumstances, there should be little surprise that our survey also finds a sharp increase in street solicitation, fueled primarily by the working poor and homeless, and that underemployment has emerged as a distinct, major cause of homelessness.

- o Perhaps the clearest impact wrought by gathering despair among many of the homeless is our survey finding that the numbers of chronic or "hard-core" homeless have grown in the vast majority of the participating cities and localities. These are mostly single adults who have simply given up seeking the help they need from our existing assistance system, because they feel "the system" has given up on them and is largely unresponsive to their needs--a conclusion that may not be entirely unreasonable in light of the bulk of this year's survey findings.

(3) Despite the continued increase in local efforts and funding commitments to provide housing for low-income households and the homeless, the shortage of affordable housing for these groups continues to grow almost everywhere in the nation and remains a major cause of homelessness. One recent estimate places the national affordable housing gap above seven million units.

Ninety-six percent of our survey participants conclude that local efforts alone cannot reverse this trend without both massive additional federal appropriations and new federal program approaches.

The revelations now engulfing HUD, moreover, would seem to confirm the conclusion that increased federal funding alone will not accomplish this unless accompanied by more effective federal program structures. This is not to say that the federal housing production programs affected should be abandoned; to the contrary, some of them have worked well in the past and should be improved and expanded, rather than discarded because of inept and corrupt administration. Our survey participants have made it clear, however, that the centerpiece mechanism under the Section 8 program for producing new and rehabilitated housing--which reached its funding zenith at the end of the last decade, and which relied almost exclusively on long-term guarantees of handsome rental income streams to private developers and substantial debt service to their banks--is no longer the most effective investment for increased federal funding in America's housing future.

The federal government's withdrawal of most of its funding for this program during the 1980's severely curtailed the interest of the private development sector in producing low-income housing, thereby contributing in large measure to the

severe affordable housing shortage and the burgeoning of homelessness, particularly among families with children. Not until the middle of the decade did the vacuum begin to be partially filled by the emergence of thousands of non-profit housing groups that of necessity have developed leaner and more imaginative models for effective and feasible low-income housing production and management.

In most instances, such groups have done this in partnership with the states and local governments, which have combined existing federal mechanisms (e.g., the Low Income Housing Tax Credit and the Mortgage Revenue Bond Program) with their own tax-free bonding authority and local funds (e.g. housing trust funds) to fashion housing programs tailored to local needs. Through the use of the tax credit alone--which was more of an afterthought to the 1986 Tax Reform Act--the construction of almost 120,000 low-income units has already been subsidized.

In other instances, non-profit consortiums have attracted corporate investment with tax credit pooling and syndication efforts which provide the private sector with the opportunity to both make a social contribution and realize an economic gain. Often such corporate investment has been leveraged and recycled through revolving loan funds at minimal or no interest. Major religious institutions and foundations have sometimes provided the corpus of the no-interest revolving construction loan fund

(e.g., the Nehemiah Plan), with state bonding agencies or union pension funds providing the permanent mortgage at below market interest rates. Where such imaginative mechanisms are combined with non-profit development (in many cases, with a "sweat equity" component), they have produced low-income housing more feasibly and effectively by limiting developer profits and mortgage interest rates, the factors most often responsible for propelling housing costs beyond affordability for low and moderate income households. When unsaddled by huge debt service, non-profit groups have also demonstrated that they can operate and maintain such housing more economically through a combination of limited management profits, and the use of skewed rentals and a variety of internal rent subsidy techniques.

In short, the non-profit housing sector has come of age during the last decade and, along with the states and local governments which have had to learn how to more effectively stretch scarce housing dollars, should now become far more meaningful partners with the federal government in the structure of any new federal housing funding initiatives. Indeed, this year's survey participants overwhelmingly (90%) recommended this approach, rather than simply increasing funding under the principal Section 8 housing production program to 1981 levels.

(4) The emergence in our survey of unemployment and underemployment as virtually co-leaders with the shortage of

affordable low-income housing as the principal cause of homelessness is also noteworthy. To a considerable extent, it is a somewhat overdue recognition of the widening gulf over the last decade between semi and low-skilled wages, which tend to hover around or slightly above the minimum wage level, and the normal rate of increased costs of basic necessities, including the cheapest low-income housing. The same gap has been permitted to widen with respect to the levels and real purchasing power of welfare grants, which have also lagged considerably behind. Indeed, many of our survey participants cited this development in combination with underemployment as the primary cause of homelessness. While there are a variety of statistics supporting this conclusion, one of the most telling is the fact that 63 percent of renter households with annual incomes at or below the federal poverty level pay more than half their incomes for housing, much of it substandard.

The result is that many American households which would have been classified as low income in the middle 1970s are now actually very low income or poor households in terms of the real purchasing power of current wages and income levels. Until this fundamental imbalance is corrected, all the grand schemes for production of more affordable housing and welfare reform will have little chance of success no matter how inventive. It will avail us little in the long run to make huge additional investments of public funds to produce more affordable low-income

housing if it cannot be feasibly operated or maintained because those who occupy it do not have enough income to support it. Nor will it be of any real help should we experience some success in moving more from welfare to work, if the fruits of their labor can scarcely meet the costs of basic necessities. This sobering reality helps to explain the reluctance of most of our survey participants to place much confidence in the promise of major results from the current welfare reform effort still in its nascent stages.

This is not to say that efforts to adequately fund and properly structure welfare reform and affordable housing initiatives should not proceed apace; to the contrary, the gathering support for these efforts is a window of opportunity which must be maximized in what now seems to be a more favorable climate for these initiatives. At the same time, however, parallel efforts must be generated for correction in the fundamental income imbalance. Otherwise, any gain realized from reform in federal welfare and low-income housing policies may prove transitory and ultimately counter-productive. Some immediate measures to initiate this parallel effort in 1990 are suggested hereafter.

* * *

Fortunately, there is some good news reported by our survey which prevented this last year from representing a bleak retreat in the effort to address homelessness:

(a) For the first year since 1985, the growth in homelessness among families with children appears to have leveled off. Our prior national survey report covering the 1985-86 winter first warned that families with children had become the fastest growing segment of the homeless population, and almost every national survey since has repeated that trend. Our survey this year shows that homeless family members comprise approximately 31 percent of the total homeless population (Table II), which indicates that homelessness among families with children increased at a significantly lower rate than the general level of increase in homelessness among all cities and localities surveyed.

The reasons for this trend are varied, but undoubtedly include the ripening of some of the substantially increased commitments by local governments to subsidize affordable low-income housing (mostly for families) that we first reported in our 1987 survey, and which this year's survey indicates are continuing to expand, despite the federal government's further withdrawal of funding for such efforts and the implementation debacle which apparently flourished at HUD through much of the Reagan era. An increase in homelessness prevention programs targeted to low-income families in many survey cities and localities has also contributed to this positive development.

Lest we prematurely celebrate the permanent abatement of increased family homelessness, however, our survey this year also reports an across-the-board increase (all cities and localities except one) in "hidden homeless" families--those doubled up in over-crowded and/or substandard housing, at risk of becoming actually homeless at any moment. A recession or other negative economic development could plummet large numbers of them into homelessness, while seriously curtailing local government efforts to close the widening affordable housing gap.

(b) The extent of increased locally-designed housing programs for low-income households already referred to is of particular significance because it includes a substantial growth in efforts to provide permanent housing specifically for the homeless. In our 1987 survey we reported that fifteen cities and localities (34%) had started or were firmly committed to new local low-income housing production programs. However, only three included permanent housing for homeless as of the close of 1986. Over two years later, twenty-four survey cities and localities (54%) now have local low-income housing programs, and fifteen of those specifically include permanent housing for the homeless. This trend could be substantially nourished by the new federal approach now being considered which would combine expanded funding with a structure that embraces and integrates the recently developed local government and non-profit housing expertise previously discussed.

(c) Despite the necessity for some further programmatic revisions, the McKinney Act is starting to have some real impact in providing funding for shelter, transitional programs and other emergency services. Follow-up interviews with survey participants confirm that the principal criticisms relate to: (i) lack of opportunity for non-profit service provider imput into the local Comprehensive Homeless Assistance Plan; (ii) eligibility restrictions on participation by religious organizations; (iii) unresponsiveness and poor coordination among some of the participating federal agencies; (iv) short timeframes for submitting proposals; (v) unrealistic matching requirements for some of the programs; (vi) overemphasis on unemployment rates in funding allocations under the Emergency Food and Shelter Program (FEMA), and (vii) lack of adequate appropriations, particularly for the programs designed to provide services for homeless with special needs, including the mentally ill, and those with drug and/or alcohol dependencies. (Many participants report that a substantial number of shelter turnaways in their city or locality were the result of the paucity of shelters designed to serve these special needs groups).

Many of these criticisms have already been addressed, at least in part, by recent legislation, and we are confident that this is a continuing process, guided by a congressional leadership that appears committed to doing what is necessary to

increase the effectiveness of the Act's programs to provide largely emergency assistance (with exception of only two of its twenty programs, the McKinney Act was not designed or intended to address permanent solutions). We are also encouraged by President Bush's commitment to fully fund the Act in the next fiscal year, as well as by HUD Secretary Kemp's actions to insure improved coordination of the individual federal agencies administering the Act's programs, through a more effective and responsive Interagency Council on the Homeless.

(d) Finally, notwithstanding an increase in chronic homelessness, survey participants estimate that less than 6 percent either became or remain homeless by their own choice. This compares favorably with our last survey finding in 1987 that only 7.3 percent were homeless by choice, and should help put to rest some recent suggestions that many or most of the homeless are so because they choose to be.

A NATIONAL AGENDA

FOR

ADDRESSING HOMELESSNESS IN 1990 AND BEYOND

A NATIONAL AGENDA FOR ADDRESSING HOMELESSNESS IN 1990 AND BEYOND

As previously discussed, the climate of public opinion in the country seems to have finally moved our policy-makers to begin to address the root causes of homelessness on several fronts.

These include persistent poverty marked by long-term welfare dependency; a deepening chasm between employment and public benefit income for the poor (including health care coverage), and the minimum income levels necessary to pay for rent and basic necessities; a huge and increasing shortage of affordable low and moderate income housing; employment training programs that do not reach the homeless and economically disadvantaged; a welfare system providing few incentives and little effective assistance (including child care) to move from welfare to meaningful employment; and programs for the homeless not sufficiently targeted to the substantial numbers of those disabled with mental illness, substance/alcohol dependencies and AIDS related conditions.

As we enter a new decade, both Congress and the

Administration appear poised to consider a variety of measures which address many of these contributing causes, some in rather dramatic fashion. The recommendations which follow are designed to increase the effectiveness and scope of these measures and eliminate the gaps in what has the potential to be a comprehensive blueprint to address homelessness in the 1990s. Particular care has been to include only those recommendations that are considered achievable, both in terms of budgetary constraints and what we sense is the mood of Congress and the Administration to move forward.

A. Correcting The Income Imbalance.

As previously discussed, many of the survey participants are less than sanguine about the eventual success of any specific approaches proposed, absent a parallel effort to correct the widening income disparity that in the last decade or so has placed huge numbers of Americans beyond subsistence and full participation in society. Indeed, one recent congressional study shows that income adjusted for inflation and family size dropped 10 percent for the poorest fifth of the population from 1979 to 1987, while the living standard of the top fifth rose by 19 percent during that period.

Put another way, the answer to the overriding problem of the two societies we have created--the haves and have-nots--

cannot simply be ever-deepening subsidies for more and more basic necessities (housing, food stamps, health services and insurance, child care, etc.,etc.) for a continually expanding and very poor population: That ccurse of action not only creates greater non-productive dependency, while robbing the recipients of their dignity and the incentive to embrace social norms, but it also flirts with eventual disaster for our economic structure.

Correcting this fundamental chasm will not be without pain, but the time to "bite the bullet" and at least initiate corrective action would seem to be well upon us. Accordingly, we recommend the following to begin the effort:

Restore the purchasing power of the Minimum Wage by Increasing it to $4.85 per hour. It is unthinkable to most Americans who are not poor that anyone should be asked to work 40 hours a week at a meaningful, full-time job without earning close to $200 gross pay. It is no mere coincidence that the average hourly wage of those placed in employment under the principal federal job training program last year was $4.87. We simply can't expect the employed homeless to vacate the shelters, if they can't earn a living wage that will put them within reach of decent housing and pay for other necessities.

When the minimum wage was last increased to $3.35 per hour in 1981, it was sufficient to maintain most poor families at

least at the poverty level. Its purchasing power has since been seriously eroded over 40 percent by inflation. Currently, a mother with two children must earn $5.63 per hour just to keep her family at poverty level.

This catch-up increase should be phased in over three years (fifty cents each year), without the subterfuge of a six month sub-minimum "training" wage for new hires. Although some low-paying jobs might be eliminated, most credible studies project that the negative impact would be minimal. While both Congress and the Administration recognize the critical need for such action, their attempt at a compromise approach failed earlier this year. Another effort will surely be made in the coming year, which hopefully should approach the recommended level of increase.

Increase The Earned Income Tax Credit. Restoring the purchasing power of the minimum wage could be supplemented by combining it with a moderate increase in the refundable Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) for the working poor, which should be graduated to account for family size. The EITC is set as a percentage of initial earnings and phased out as earnings rise, but does not account for relative family size. In 1990, we recommend (i) adding a one percent increase in the EITC for each dependent child above a family of three with a cap at four dependent children, and (ii) that EITC refunds be made by

periodic advances, rather than with one payment at the end of the year. Further expanding the per dependant child differential, including the cap, should be considered as federal budgetary problems hopefully recede.

As part of a $16 billion child care initiative, the House Ways and Means Committee has included a measure which would provide a steeper graduated increase in the tax credit relating to child care costs to begin in 1990, and targeted primarily to families with $7-11,000 annual incomes, which we support.

Establish a National Minimum Benefit Standard. The nation's principal welfare program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), no longer adequately fulfills either of its major functions--work readiness and temporary support. Instead it has evolved into an almost limitless income maintenance program, fostering passive dependency in far too many instances.

While the Family Support Act of 1988 ("welfare reform") begins to address this problem by creating a new approach to hasten the transition from welfare to work, it will impact on only a few AFDC recipients towards the end of 1990 and lacks provisions for more adequate benefit levels. Meanwhile, huge discrepancies in the benefit levels persist among many states (in some instances by as much as a 5:1 ratio), with the lowest providing benefits well below half of the poverty level. While

certain variations are justified by regional CPI differences, there is a level below which no state should be permitted to go. To assist in addressing growing homelessness, we should begin to eliminate this inequity in the coming year by establishing a national minimum benefit equal to one-half of the Federal poverty level (AFDC plus food stamps). This should be coupled with regulations which more uniformly ease restrictions on earned income or stipends.

A great deal more must, of course, be done to implement a more fundamental refocus of the welfare system, much of which is already in the initial stages of development, as discussed hereinafter. While that effort is moving forward, however, this modest adjustment can be achieved in the coming year without offending budget limitation realities. The larger task of moving the national benefit floor to at least the poverty level, should be a priority for the first part of the decade.

B. Increasing Opportunities for Employment and Self-sufficiency.

The homeless of working age, when not inhibited by physical or mental barriers, should be afforded more significant assistance and incentives for obtaining and maintaining meaningful employment, including basic medical coverage. Important movement towards this goal is realistically achievable

in 1990, as follows:

Restructure Federal Job-Training Programs to Reach the Unskilled and Disadvantaged. The principal federal employment training program for the poor, the 1982 Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), has compiled a limited record of achievement by placing primarily the ablest of the poor into relatively dead-end jobs after mostly short-term training.

JTPA should be credited with restoring a measure of public confidence in the nation's employment and training system and for building a broad base of private sector support. However,by placing too much emphasis on outcomes (such as placement rates and cost per placement) rather than impacts, it may have achieved its limited gains at the cost of neglecting the groups with the greatest need for job training services.

Fortunately, a consensus has now been reached among policymakers that the emphasis of JTPA must be refocused to target comprehensive programs towards the hardest cases--those unemployed who are both economically disadvantaged and lacking basic education and life skills -- with particular attention to youth and adults, including the homeless. There are a number of bills designed to accomplish this result, including those introduced by the Bush Administration, which are now receiving serious attention by both the Senate and the House. Most of the

refocus mechanisms contained in these bills incorporate the recommendations put forward earlier this year in a report issued by a panel of JTPA practitioners and experts on employment policy assembled by the Secretary of Labor.

While a full discussion of all of the recommendations in that report and the proposed bills is beyond the purview of this proposal, we strongly recommend that the JTPA amendments finally agreed to include the following strategies to focus program resources on harder-to-serve adults and youth:

o Remove disincentives to including the hardest cases which presently pervade the JTPA system, by adjusting performance standards to include both direct measures of employability (e.g., prior employment, welfare history, homelessness) and achievement of intermediate impacts ("process measures") short of actual employment, and by eliminating cost standards from the formula used to distribute incentive funds.

o Incentive awards and payment benchmarks for service provider performance must also be adjusted to include significant impacts (e.g., acquiring basic educational skills, or obtaining housing, in the case of a homeless individual) rather than relying almost entirely on positive outcomes.

o Current restrictions should be modified to permit more

spending on the support services and administrative functions necessary to include the severely disadvantaged. We embrace the suggestions of the Manpower Development Research Corp. that the cap on administrative costs be increased to 20 percent and that support services and training be combined into one category accounting for at least 80 percent of spending. Similarly, limitations on work experience and stipends should be relaxed to allow participants to earn some income during longer-term programs.

o Complex intake procedures should be minimized, including acceptance of substantial demonstration of eligibility, rather than insistence upon 100 percent documentation of each eligibility criteria.

The integration of the foregoing concepts into the JTPA structure will send a strong message that the system must accommodate less job-ready eligibles. We hasten to add, however, that these modifications should be accomplished without changing the JTPA service delivery system that is based on a partnership at the local level between the private sector and local elected officials, and on state oversight with local service delivery. This structure has both solidified private sector support for the program and made it responsive to the needs of employers--both of which will be critical to expanded effectiveness.

While the House Appropriations Committee has included some funding for the JTPA homeless component (in the HHS appropriation), the McKinney Act also includes a promising but underfunded Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program (under the Department of Labor) for which a minimum funding level of $38 million is recommended for the coming year. This demonstration program is structured to focus on impacts by specifically funding basic skills instruction; remedial education; basic literacy instruction; job search and counselling, and job preparation training (e.g. resume writing).

An additional employment program for harder-to-serve cases has also been added for the coming year through the McKinney Act. Under the Jobs for Employable Dependent Individuals (JEDI), bonuses for job placements are distributed through the states to Service Delivery Areas (SDA) which may use them to provide JTPA services and for bonuses to service providers. The bonuses continue for up to three years where employment is continuous, and eligible individuals must have participated in education training and other job readiness activities under the program. The structure of JEDI appears to be generally consistent with the JTPA refocus recommendations and should be funded at $20.5 million to provide an opportunity for reasonable impact during 1990.

Just as important as increased funding, however, will be an effort to accurately assess the effectiveness of these and other employment and training programs which are either directed specifically towards the homeless or to populations which include substantial homeless (e.g., the JOBS program in the Family Support Act). While the proliferation of these programs is welcome, we know very little about their outcomes and even less about their impacts. In short, there is no adequate system in place to assess their relative effectiveness and feasibility so that their funding and structure can be properly evaluated and focused.

To meet this important need, we recommend federal funding of an effort similar to JOBSTART, a promising nationwide demonstration intensive training program directed to severely disadvantaged youth. Extensive evaluations of that program have developed valuable lessons which have resulted in many of the consensus recommendations for modifying JTPA. The Interagency Council on The Homeless should be funded to provide similar intensive evaluation efforts of all employment training programs for the homeless.

Medicaid Should be Extended as a Transitional Benefit To The Disadvantaged Completing Job Training. Many homeless in America are in that position because they had no health insurance coverage to protect them against the overwhelming costs of severe

or catastrophic illness. There are now 31-37 million in the nation who have no health insurance coverage, and many more whose coverage does not include major costs of catastrophic illnesses. Of these, over 12 million are poor, but ineligible for Medicaid because they are not receiving cash welfare grants (federal law does not mandate such coverage in all states). In fact, over one-half of the nation's poor are not covered by Medicaid.

The new welfare reform law will mandate a year's coverage to ease the transition for those moving from AFDC to employment, but most will not be included until well after 1990, and single adults on home relief or other types of public benefits and those categorically ineligible for cash assistance will not be included in many states. Correspondingly, a substantial portion of the jobs for which JTPA disadvantaged participants will undergo intensive preparation under the refocused program will not include employer-provided health insurance coverage.

To be meaningful, any opportunity for employment must include the financial protections afforded by basic health insurance coverage both to assist those emerging from homelessness and to prevent further homelessness. We accordingly recommend that the medical coverage be extended to include the disadvantaged unemployed either participating in the JTPA program, or in a similar serious employment training program, to include both the period of the training program and a full year

after job placement, provided the employer is not providing equivalent health benefits.

In making this recommendation, we are not unmindful that it will reach only a modest portion of the working and other poor not presently provided health insurance coverage, and that this country must move more swiftly towards the national goal of universal health coverage for all Americans. One excellent proposal to achieve this goal has been put forward by the Ford Foundation Project on Social Welfare and the American Future; it would require employers either to offer a basic package of health insurance coverage to workers (including catastrophic expense coverage) or to contribute a per employee amount to a public fund that would finance coverage for uninsured workers, with Medicaid reform extending to all presently uncovered or ineligible poor.

Although policymakers are moving towards addressing this problem, it is unrealistic to suggest that any such comprehensive program will be enacted over the next year. It will be difficult enough to get Congress and the Bush Administration to raise the minimum wage, as recommended, and that action the is a major under-girding of the entire effort to lift the poor out of persistent poverty and away from homelessness. The dialogue on universal health coverage should proceed apace in 1990, and hopefully be high on the agenda for serious action in the following year.

Recast Unemployment Insurance To Provide Re-employment Incentives. Unemployment insurance was primarily designed in the 1930s to help those with substantial work histories bridge temporary unemployment, such as lay-offs. In today's constantly shifting, more mobile national economy, many more people have to change industries, occupations and regions to seek employment in more promising labor markets.

Eligibles who become unemployed in declining labor markets should be assisted in this effort to find new markets for their skills or to acquire new skills in greater demand by being able to qualify for two lump-sum benefit payments; the first 13-week of benefits to be paid upon initial qualification and certification of intention to move to a new labor market, followed by a similar lump-sum payment conditioned upon verification that the individual is still unemployed in the new labor market selected. Lacking such verification, the recipient would be returned to the regular benefit schedule, if still unemployed.

People are now out of work for longer periods of time, and are more likely to exhaust their unemployment benefits. Last year, only 32 percent of the unemployed received unemployment insurance benefits, as opposed to 81 percent in 1975. Where unemployment persists beyond the normal 26-week benefit period,

benefits should be continued for up to an additional period of 13 weeks, provided the recipient verifies participation in a JTPA employment training program or substantial equivalent for at least 10 weeks prior to the expiration of the initial benefit period.

Collectively, these measures would make a significant contribution to preventing homelessness, without burdensome additional costs.

C. Reducing the Affordable Housing Gap for Low-income Households.

The huge and increasing lack of affordable housing for low-income households--which some estimates now place at over seven million units--can at least be stemmed by some basic initiatives during the coming year, as follows:

Enact the National Affordable Housing Act, with modifications. After several years of introducing ambitious housing initiatives which went nowhere, bi-partisan Senate support seems to be developing for the National Affordable Housing Act, which the Administration also appears prepared to accept. In addition to reversing the policy of dismantling federal housing assistance (over seventy-five percent reductions in the last eight years) by substantially increasing funding for

HUD housing production programs, the Act would establish a Housing Opportunities Program ("HOP") that would shift the emphasis in designing federally assisted housing programs to the states and municipalities, and would encourage them to invest matching funds in "partnership" efforts which would include the types of innovative non-profit housing participation previously discussed.

This Act would also amend the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act to combine all of the HUD programs for the homeless, excepting the Sec. 8 SRO moderate rehabilitation program, into a block grant which would distribute 80 percent of their combined funding by formula to localities (70%) and states (30%), with the balance distributed directly in HUD discretionary grants for innovative proposals submitted as part of a national competition. While intended to permit states and localities more flexibility and wider discretion in tailoring local responses ranging from shelter to permanent and supportive housing, including measures to prevent homelessness, the Act would provide no additional funding above the increases already proposed for these programs. In addition, the Act creates a new position of Assistant Secretary for Supportive Services to administer programs exclusively serving the elderly, the handicapped, the homeless, and other requiring housing-related supportive services, which presumably includes homeless and near homeless people with AIDS and related conditions. Total proposed funding

would be almost $15 billion for each of the next two years, although it is less than certain that this level will be appropriated in 1990.

This proposed Act is by no means a panacea; the up to three billion or so in funding suggested for the HOP initiative and the subsidies proposed for homeless housing falls far short of what recent authoritative studies and reports almost unanimously conclude will be necessary to begin to reduce the low-income housing shortage. Indeed, over 90 percent of the cities and localities participating in our survey would rather see the enactment of the previously introduced Affordable Housing Act, which would provide $9 billion annually in outright grants over five years for the construction and rehabilitation of 7.5 million affordable low-income housing units, with a much larger role for non-profit development and management.

While apparently ready to reverse the trends of the last eight years, however, Congress and the Administration are clearly not prepared to do so in one fell swoop during a period of mandatory budget cutting. Although far from perfect, the proposed National Affordable Housing Act is an important step in the right direction and, on balance, should be supported. It would not be surprising, moreover, if the combination of increased funding and the concepts of the housing opportunities program embodied in the Act would result in a synergistic impact, producing far more

affordable housing than the 150,000 units per year anticipated. In short, the proposed Act has the potential to be the cornerstone of a new approach to federally assisted housing which can be built upon and improved over the coming decade. Nevertheless, it is recommended that the HOP initiative be funded at $4 billion annually and that funding for certain of the programs to create permanent housing for the homeless be increased (see discussion under "Expanding The Effectiveness of The McKinney Act," infra).

As this proposal winds its way through the legislative process, however, we would urge housing and homeless advocates to work for modifications that would strengthen the role of non-profit housing and self-help groups by providing separate funding to support community housing partnership activities, and to tilt the increased funding more towards grants and operating assistance rather than loans, which hamper affordability.

We would also suggest reconsideration of some of the provisions of the proposed Act which would ease certain of the down payment and F.H.A. mortgage insurance requirements for first-time home buyers and those who have not owned a home for three years. We applaud the proposal to permit IRA funds to be used as down payments by such home buyers without incurring a tax penalty. However, lowering the minimum down payment from 5% to 3% may be inviting a renewal of the flood of F.H.A. insured

mortgage defaults which occurred in the 1970s, because the purchasers were not able to meet the long-term monthly debt service payments. While there is no question that measures must be taken to ensure that more young people have the opportunity to purchase a home, it would be counter-productive over the longer term to reduce underwriting criteria to the point where many may be at risk of ultimately losing their homes. Perhaps it would be more prudent first to measure the effect of permitting the use of IRAs as down payments to stimulate home purchases, before going on to consider the lowering of required down payments further.

It would also seem ill-advised to eliminate the $101,250 cap on F.H.A. insured mortgages and substitute instead a maximum of 95 percent of the median sales price in the area. This would permit the use of the F.H.A. mortgage insurance program for the purchase of homes in the most expensive neighborhoods in the country--a purpose for which that program was never intended. We would suggest simply increasing the cap by 30-35 percent.

According to a recent study, almost 30 percent of the nearly 5.7 million unsubsidized units renting for $300 a month or less are in a deteriorating condition and at risk of loss. The F.H.A. mortgage insurance program would better be used for continuing and expanding low-interest home improvement loan programs for low-income owner-occupants of rental properties, such as the HIP loan program in New York City, in an effort to save this

irreplaceable housing stock for the poor and the homeless.

Restrict Local Regulatory Codes Which Inhibit Low-Income Housing Production. Although talked about for many years, a concerted effort has never been made to restrict the inhibiting effects of local regulatory housing codes on federal low-income housing production programs. Testimony at last year's national conference on homelessness sponsored by the National Home Builders Association clearly established that cumbersome and often conflicting local housing approval processes are increasing development costs by as much as 50-75 percent, and almost doubling the time required to produce housing, mostly in the areas of the country where the lack of low-income housing and homelessness are at their peak.

One simple way of eliminating these inhibitions would be to place a reasonable limit on the local approval process period, as a condition for receiving federal project-based housing assistance, with carefully crafted provisions for exceptions and waivers under unusual circumstances.

Both homeless and housing advocates and the private development industry have indicated their preparedness to join in such an effort, and Secretary Kemp has committed HUD to establish the Joint Ventures for Affordable Housing program to pursue this goal. That effort should proceed apace, provided it is not used

to seek to eliminate local rent and stabilization laws. Indeed, the success of this effort may have a large impact on the ability of the new concepts proposed in the National Affordable Housing Act to produce affordable low income housing more swiftly and cheaply.

We recommend a priority cooperative effort to pursue this goal during the coming year.

Preserve Low Income Housing Units For Which Federal Subsidies Are Expiring. The National Low Income Housing Preservation Commission last year projected a potential loss during the next fifteen years of over one-half million low-income federally subsidized units because of expiring use restrictions that permit conversions to higher income occupancy or weak financial conditions that result in disinvestment and abandonment.

While the Emergency Low Income Preservation Act is generally credited with forestalling an immediate crisis, albeit imperfectly, a more equitable and comprehensive plan must be adopted to preserve these units for low-income tenants, or the vast majority will be at serious risk of becoming homeless.

One possible solution proposed is the recently introduced

Low Income Housing Preservation Act (HR 1057), which would provide grant assistance to tenants and non-profits to purchase such at risk units, but it appears to be considerably under-funded. In addition, the National Affordable Housing Act calls for the establishment with HUD of an Office of Affordable Housing Preservation to work with and provide technical assistance to states and localities to devise feasible strategies for retaining affordable housing for low-and moderate income households.

Senior HUD officials recently committed to the goal of resolving this potentially disastrous problem this year, a goal with which we thoroughly concur. One new source of subsidy loans for tenants desiring to purchase and renovate their units could be the cash advance program mandated for the Federal Home Loan Bank System under the S&L Bailout Bill (HR 1278). Because preserving these units for low-income occupancy is of such paramount importance, we suggest that HUD and Congress consider targeting the funds under this program specifically for such purpose.

Extend and Modify The Low Income Housing Tax Credit. As previously discussed, this tax credit is perhaps the only new federal housing assistance initiative during this decade which has worked, primarily due to the innovativeness of non-profit housing partnerships in cooperation with state and local governments.

Congress is about to reauthorize the program, and the following are our recommendations for modifications in the final version of the reauthorization legislation:

o make the tax credit permanent;

o require 30 year low-income use on tax credit properties;

o eliminate penalties for using tax-exempt or federally assisted financing, including the use of project-based Section 8 Certificates;

o eliminate the 6-month lease requirement for single room occupancy (SRO) buildings;

o make the pay-out period 10 or 15 years, at the option of the sponsor;

o permit waiver of the minimum rehabilitation standard for HUD or FMHA assisted properties, which standard should remain at the greater of $3,000 per unit or 10 percent of unadjusted basis;

o provide tenants the right of first refusal on resale of tax credit properties and allow non-profit lenders to enter into up-front purchase agreements with investors covering the ultimate disposition of the properties.

Preserve And Modernize Public Housing Units. The oldest federally-assisted housing program for the poor is public housing, where the average household incomes are hardly above half the current poverty level. Almost three thousand communities

have public housing projects with about 1.4 million eligible units. The average age of these complexes is 28 years, with many having been occupied for 35-50 years and now in need of major repair and upgrading. Some estimates place the cost of modernizing the public housing inventory at over 20 billion dollars.

Several pending House bills propose substantial funding for this purpose (HR 140, 969, 1122), but their suggested funding levels would appear to have little chance of surviving the appropriations process during the current congressional session. The leading Senate vehicle (at least at the time this report is published) seems to be the National Affordable Housing Act which would authorize 1990 increases in public housing operating subsidies of up to $116 million and $185 million for modernization. That Act would also establish a National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing to develop a plan for eliminating substandard conditions in public housing by the year 2000.

While this movement is encouraging, it will hardly come close to the projected need. A 1990 appropriation of at least an additional $160 million for public housing modernization is recommended, above the increases suggested in that Act.

D. Expanding the Effectiveness of the McKinney Act.

As previously discussed, the McKinney Act has now started to realize street impact beyond many original expectations. This has been due in no small measure to congressional structuring of the many programs established and/or funded under the Act, and its consistent oversight and modifications of those programs. Considering the magnitude of the task of requiring the coordination and cooperation of nine different federal agencies involved in the Act's twenty programs and the further obstacle posed by the necessity of vertical integration of local funding and provider mechanisms, one might well have anticipated a veritable boondoggle--similar to that involving major HUD programs and the nation's savings and loan associations. The reality thus far is in sharp contrast.

Congress should be applauded for its vigilance in monitoring and fine-tuning the McKinney Act. While we are here suggesting some further needed modifications, our principal recommendation is quite simple: The basic structure provided by the McKinney Act actually works, and should now be dramatically expanded, particularly to provide vastly increased services to the homeless with drug/alcohol dependencies, mental illness, and AIDS related illnesses, as well as permanent housing for homeless single adults and job training/placement programs.

Increased Funding. This survey shows that primarily because of McKinney Act funding, far more types of services are now available to the homeless than before. Correspondingly, however, these additional services are not available at anywhere near sufficient levels, particularly (i) job training/placement, (ii) permanent SRO Housing for homeless single adults, and (iii) services targeted to the special needs of those who have drug dependencies, mental illness, and AIDS related illnesses.

As these are the subpopulations which our survey shows are now on the cutting edge of growing homelessness, we recommend major funding increases in FY '90 for programs targeted to those subpopulations, as follows:

o Alcohol/Drug Abuse Demonstration Program should be funded at $105 million;

o Mental Health Demonstration Program should be funded at $38.4 million;

o Mental Health Block Grant Program should be funded at $57 million;

o Job Training For The Homeless Program should be funded at $38 million;

o Job Training For Employable Dependent Individuals (JEDI) Program should be funded at $20.5 million;

o SRO unit Sec. 8 Assistance should be funded at $200 million (now budgeted for $50 million), and the per unit cap on assistance raised to $20,000, which is more reflective of market costs for moderate rehabilitation;

o Supplemental Assistance For Facilities to Assist Homeless (SAFAH) should be funded at $26 million;

The above recommended increases in funding for seven targeted programs total $340 million, and represent about a 50 percent increase in total funding for all McKinney Act programs for FY '90 at full authorization levels.

Modification of Programs. While many of the concerns expressed by the survey participants have been at least partially addressed by amendatory legislation, we take the liberty of recommending additional modifications to provide increased effectiveness of McKinney Act Programs, as follows;

o The distribution formula for the FEMA Emergency Food and Shelter Program should be changed so that it does not rely primarily on unemployment statistics--which tend to be transitory and not accurately reflective of the relative dimensions of

homelessness in many states and localities. The formula should be weighted to include at least a 50 percent factor for the relative number of households in the state/local area with annual incomes less than 20 percent above the poverty level. Alternatively, a 50 percent factor could be included based upon the relative number of homeless actually sheltered and/or provided emergency services during the prior year, as certified by the state or locality.

o The deadline for spending or committing FEMA funds should be extended to March 31 of the following year. In addition, FEMA should disburse all funds to the National Board by October 10th; the National Board should, in turn, transmit the funds to the Local Boards by October 20th, and the Local Boards should insure that the funding reaches the Local Recipient Organizations (LRO) no later than October 31st. Presently funds are still not getting to LROs until much of the winter season is over, precisely the period when they are most needed.

o We vigorously recommend against adopting the suggestion made in a recent report of the U.S. General Accounting Office that FEMA funds be targeted more towards McKinney Act special emphasis groups. The FEMA Emergency Food and Shelter Program pre-dates the McKinney Act and has come to be relied upon as a principal funding source for programs providing general emergency shelter and food to a broad spectrum of homeless. Many of the

LROs using these funds, such as churches, synagogues and neighborhood voluntary efforts, do not have the capability or funding to provide special services tailored to the McKinney Act special emphasis groups - yet this huge network is providing the bulk of the nation's emergency response to homelessness at a huge savings of public funds, through the use of donated facilities and volunteer staffing. Redirection of FEMA funding to specialized homeless programs would have a chilling effect on these voluntary efforts, and would be counter-productive to the comprehensive goals of the Act. The specialized programs provided under other portions of the McKinney Act are the appropriate mechanisms for targeting assistance to special emphasis groups. Expanded assistance to those special needs groups should be provided by increased funding for those programs, which we have recommended immediately above - not by taking funding from the FEMA program, which is relied upon for the broader emergency needs response.

o A uniform local process, with appropriate outreach and notification to non-profit service providers, should be established for the annual submission of all local Comprehensive Homeless Assistance Plans (CHAPs) for HUD McKinney Act programs. At the least, the state or locality submitting a CHAP should be required to certify that it gave three months notice and opportunity to participate in the formulation of the CHAP to a minimum of 80 percent of local provider agencies eligible to

receive funding under HUD McKinney Act programs.

o When a state or locality either fails to submit a CHAP or does not include certain programs in its CHAP, local non-profit provider agencies eligible for funding should be permitted to submit a CHAP or a supplemental CHAP.

o Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program recipients should be required to drawdown and distribute ESG funds to local service providers or otherwise commit/encumber the grant funds within 3 months of availability. If such is not complied with, an alternative mechanism should be established for local eligible provider agencies to apply directly to HUD for a drawdown of funds.

o The formula for distributing ESG funds should be revised to include significant factors based upon the relative number of households in the state/local area whose annual incomes are at less than 20 percent above the poverty level, and/or the relative number of homeless actually sheltered or provided emergency services during the prior year, as certified to by the state or locality.

o The selection criteria for the HUD Supportive Housing Demonstration (SHD) program, and particularly the transitional housing and permanent handicapped housing components, should be

made more flexible. Specifically, the Secretary of HUD should be able to grant waivers, based upon demonstrated good cause, of both project grant maximums and minimum matching requirements, which should not exceed 30 percent variances from the current requirements for either.

o Except where prevented by constitutional considerations, religious groups should be eligible to receive capital funding to provide transitional and permanent housing without the necessity of establishing independent non-profit entities. HUD regulations otherwise adequately ensure that such funds will not be used for religious purposes, and there is no logical reason to impose any additional onerous burdens on these groups, which have consistently provided the largest portion of the nation's response to homelessness.

o Religious groups should also be made eligible to receive funding under the Emergency Community Services Homeless Grant Program in order to support their largely underfunded efforts to provide shelter and emergency services to the homeless. Although this is one of the most generously funded McKinney Act programs ($42 million), program funds have been slow to reach agencies providing direct services to the homeless. Exclusion of religious groups from eligibility for funding under this program has resulted in their inability to obtain any funding for staffing for their huge shelter and service efforts (FEMA funds

cannot be used for staffing). This is an inequity which should be swiftly corrected, particularly since religious groups provide the most effective leveraging of public funds through donated facilities and services.

o Finally, we strongly recommend against transforming federal supervision of the Emergency Food and Shelter Program from FEMA to HUD, as suggested in the proposed National Affordable Housing Act. The present mechanism for distribution of funds through the National and local boards to local service providers has worked reasonably well and will be even more efficient if the recommendations we have suggested are adopted. Transferring the program to HUD and folding it into formula block grants to states and localities would almost completely change this system, and likely result in substantial delays in getting these funds to the street level where they are desparately needed.

E. Implementing Welfare Reform

Prior recommendations have addressed needed refocusing of several major components of the welfare system to reduce and prevent persistent poverty and homelessness. The centerpiece of welfare reform, the Family Support Act of 1988 (FSA), features the creation of a Job Opportunities and Basic Skills program (JOBS) in each state by October 1990. Unfortunately, participation will be limited by funding; states are only

required to have 7 percent of their non-exempt AFDC caseload participating by 1990 and 20 percent by 1995.

The JOBS program is designed to assist those on welfare--particularly long-term AFDC recipients-- gain the education, skills and opportunities needed to leave AFDC and enter employment. For the first time, the states are mandated to offer a wide range of education, training, and employment activities tailored to the individual needs and abilities of the participants and important federal funding is provided for this purpose. Significant support services, such as child care and health care coverage, are now mandated not only during the recipients' participation in JOBS program activities, but for a period after they have moved to employment, to ease the transition from dependency. Through a structure which fosters recipient participation in the employability assessment, planning and goal determination process, JOBS holds out the realistic hope of ending long-term welfare dependency for many.

The Department of Health and Human Services has now published regulations for the JOBS program and related supportive services, which are scheduled to be finalized shortly, after consideration of public comment. In order to ensure the effective implementation of this promising program, the following modifications are recommended in the proposed regulations:

1. The requirement that individuals participate in specified JOBS program activities for a minimum period of time each month to be counted towards the Act's participation rate requirements is too restrictive. Time spent in additional activities should also count toward the required participation rate--including time spent in orientation, employability assessment, developing the employability plan and performing homework, as well as a reasonable time spent prior to or between assignment to appropriate JOBS activities. Experience suggests that the critical activities of individual assessment and employability development planning are key to an individual's success in achieving self-sufficiency; as proposed, the durational definition of participation will drive the program towards meeting hourly requirements on less intensive activities, (e.g., group job search or community work experience),in place of achieving employment goals through the careful assessment and employability plan development process.

2. In establishing service delivery areas within statewide JOBS programs, the states should not be limited to the narrowly defined "political subdivision", but have the flexibility to define the appropriate boundaries of service delivery areas, including use of JTPA service delivery area (SDA) definitions or some other basis which more accurately reflects an appropriate labor market in a particular area.

3. The regulation should be dropped prohibiting the states from continuing to use AFDC special needs payments to fund child care and other work or training related supportive services. In many cases, this prohibition would inhibit successful participation in the JOBS program, and restrict needed flexibility.

4. The "maintenance of effort" requirement for continuation of funding by the states of existing activities should be based on total existing activity spending, rather than the spending on each service component. This will permit states important flexibility in meeting individualized service needs.

5. Several of the proposed regulations relating to child care would not only limit reimbursement for this vital support service, but could unduly burden both states and participants. Arbitrarily limiting the local market rate to the 75th percentile cost of child care would further exacerbate the problem of providing scarce child care, particularly for the many states already paying more; states should be permitted to set and pay market rates for appropriately defined service delivery areas. Moreover, federal matching funds should be available for the critical recruitment and/or training of child care providers. Finally, recipients moving off AFDC should not be required to go through the additional paperwork of applying for transitional child care benefits, provided they move directly to employment.

When there is a gap of at least one month, however, states should have the option of requiring such an application.

6. We also suggest that experience working at current minimum wage jobs requiring little or no skills should not be considered eligible as a JOBS program activity. The entire thrust of the JOBS program--and indeed a goal of welfare reform--is not just getting recipients temporarily off the welfare rolls, but assisting them in achieving longterm economic self-sufficiency. If the end result of providing all this assistance is a job which still cannot pay for housing and other essentials, the recipient will have little chance of remaining independent from public assistance for very long, and the public funds spent will have been wasted. Appropriate standards should be set by regulation for any inclusion of the work experience component, taking family composition into consideration.

Apart from these specific recommendations, one cannot help but notice the tone of many of the proposed regulations, which seems clearly one of distrust towards the states' intentions to implement welfare reform. The message seems to be that the federal government will force compliance upon the reluctant states by setting rigid, if not arbitrary, standards for matters clearly requiring flexibility for the states, which have the major responsibility of actual implementation.

This approach will not only severely hamper the program's effectiveness, but is contrary to congressional intent, which envisioned necessary state participation and interaction in decisions affecting JOBS program activities and support services. We suggest that the federal bureaucracy abandon the present course of action swiftly, before the JOBS program is smothered in its infancy. The most salutary method, we believe, would be to incorporate the aforementioned recommendations into the final regulations.

The states have been intimately involved in the process which resulted in the Family Support Act, and in the JOBS program in particular. Several have already invested heavily in new employment training initiatives that go beyond the JOBS program requirements in many respects. Most have firm plans to begin to implement the JOBS program well before the mandatory date of October 1, 1990, including 18 that began implementation this summer. The huge investment stake which the states will commit rises above that of the federal government, and ensures their enthusiastic cooperation. The states should be treated as full partners in this effort, the success of which may well hinge on such a working relationship.

F. Developing a Comprehensive Plan to Provide Supportive Housing for Homeless People with AIDS.

No where has federal leadership failed more than in

developing a plan to stimulate the provision of supportive housing for the swiftly growing numbers of homeless and near-homeless people with AIDS and related illnesses (PWAs). While much attention and funding has been directed towards research, education and prevention programs, little has been given to the equally important and difficult task of providing appropriate supportive housing and care for those who are both homeless and struggling to survive this extremely disabling and largely terminal illness.

Our survey findings clearly demonstrate that PWAs are an increasing, and in many cases, substantial segment of the homeless population in the vast majority of the cities and localities surveyed; growing homelessness among PWAs is by no means a problem restricted only to the major cities with the largest numbers of reported AIDS cases. While we normally resist offering numerical estimates of the homeless, in this instance we felt it important to provide some idea of the proportions of this heretofore ignored phenomenon. As of late last year we estimated that there were about 20,000 homeless PWAs nationally, based upon very preliminary data; using more detailed local estimates and specific information developed subsequently, we now project homeless PWAs and their dependents to number in a range of 28-32,000 across the country. Absent a salutary cure, these numbers can only dramatically increase, as the majority of the now 1.5 to 2 million believed to be HIV-infected progress to AIDS related

illnesses and full-blown AIDS.

Based upon the current average length of stay of PWAs in existing supportive housing models, utilization and variation in unit sizes, as well a recent studies indicating that about 86 percent of homeless PWAs can be adequately served by some level of supportive housing (as opposed to nursing home or longterm institutional facilities), we estimate that over 16,000 supportive housing units are needed just to adequately serve the current homeless PWA population. As best we can determine from presently available information, there are now less than one thousand appropriate supported housing units for PWAs in operation across the entire country--and, with only a few exceptions, very little in the development stage.

In addition to the specter of thousands of homeless PWAs having to struggle to exist--and in many cases expire-- in mass shelters and in the nation's streets and transportation systems, many are unable to be discharged from hospitals because they have no homes or supportive housing to go to. In many cities, this has contributed to serious patient gridlock and hugh additional expenditures, considering that the average per diem cost for a PWA in a hospital is $7-800, as opposed to the average per diem of less than $100 in supportive housing. Even more ominous is the risk that the rapidly increasing number of homeless PWAs could well reduce much of the health care delivery system to a

standstill in many of the nation's cities and localities.

Faced with these stark possibilities, the June, 1988 report of the Presidential Commission on the Human Immunodeficiency Virus Epidemic urged HUD and other federal agencies to become substantially involved in meeting the unique supportive housing needs of homeless PWAs. Apparently its message fell on deaf ears; almost sixteen months later nothing related to these supportive housing recommendations has been forthcoming from the White House or any of its federal agencies. Fortunately however, interest in starting to address this largely neglected need is beginning to intensify in Congress, and legislation providing a broad range of housing programs for homeless PWAs will shortly be introduced.

With HUD as the lead federal agency, the centerpiece of that proposal is a Permanent and Transitional Housing program for PWAs which incorporates three different approaches for providing supportive housing: (i) Use of Section 8 certificates to pay fair market rent in existing housing; (ii) Section 8 funding for rental assistance and moderate rehabilitation of single room occupancy (SRO) units; and (iii) a new program to create additional community residences for PWAs, including appropriate services.

Also included in the proposal are programs providing

emergency assistance, including rent, mortgage and utility payments to prevent homelessness, model emergency shelters with appropriate services, and funding for non-profit agencies to provide housing counselling and referral services. These combined programs would provide funding assistance for about 7,000 housing accommodations of various levels and would be funded at $290 million for each of two years. In addition to these proposed programs, the House Appropriations Committee has included funding in 1990 for 250 units of Section 202 housing. Other proposals focusing on funding health and social services for supportive housing are also being formulated in various congressional committees.

While these proposals are still a long way from final adoption, they come as a welcome "new breeze" which will hopefully enlist necessary support swiftly, before this gathering crisis overwhelms us. Whether sufficient support can be marshalled in the coming year, if leadership from the White House remains absent, may well depend upon the assistance of the business and health care communities, as well as the energy of grass roots movements and the vigilance of the media--particularly in view of the disturbing glimpse of discriminatory attitudes at the local public sector level which our survey reveals.

G. Cost Considerations: Funding the Agenda Fairly.

While much of what we have proposed relates to restructuring and focusing programs so that they work better, there will be a bill to pay for several initiatives, some of which will become due in the coming year. In certain cases, such as the linchpin measure of restoring the purchasing power of the minimum wage, the costs will be spread through the private sector and eventually be shared by most Americans. So too, the bulk of additional matching funds tied to many of the programs for which federal funding increases are recommended will come from private corporations, foundations, religious institutions, and individual contributors. The new approach to reducing the affordable housing gap, if adopted in a form embracing its principal concepts, will also require substantial investment from private sector partners, as well as states and local governments. In this fashion, all of us will contribute a reasonable fair share towards addressing what is truly a national burden.

In assessing the federal government's fair share for fiscal year 1990, we have attempted to take into account the substantial progress which has already been made in Congress for funding many of the proposals included in this Agenda. Table VII captures rough estimates of the costs for increases in existing programs and new programs in 1990, over and above levels already proposed in Congress and/or by the Administration, and expresses those

costs both on the basis of annual expenditures required when the proposals are fully phased in (annual authorization) and expenditures actually required during 1990, as they are being phased in (1990 appropriation).

One caveat should be noted. In determining the floor from which to measure the additional increases attached to some of the Agenda proposals, we have generally used the standard that the floor increased costs must be already introduced in Congress, and either adopted in congressional budget resolutions or under serious consideration by a major committee, together with some public indication of support for the program from the Administration. The standard may be seriously skewed, however, even as this document is released, when Congress is faced with reconciling its total spending requests with the reality of Gramm-Rudman mandates and total revenue estimates. Application of the standard would nevertheless have continuing relevance, as we would anticipate that the proposed spending increases for these programs would continue to be pursued by way of supplemental appropriations or the budget for 1991.

In the final analysis, what we have done here is to use the most accurate and informed present estimates as possible, subject to the vicissitudes of the legislative budgetary process and the constraints dictated by an overall policy of deficit reduction. On that basis, the additional increases driven by the Agenda

proposals should be about $2.773 billion in 1990--a relatively modest request compared to increases for other major programs, and considering the magnitude and complexity of the problem it is designed to address.

How to pay the federal bill is an equally important consideration. There are a variety of specific options which could be used without offending deficit reduction targets. Ultimately, however, these options all depend upon certain basic approaches - diverting federal expenditures presently allocated to other programs (sometimes through "savings"), enhancing federal revenues by increasing taxes, or limiting tax deductions and exclusions. To these must be added the school of thought which holds that by reducing certain tax rates, e.g., capital gains, federal tax revenues are substantially stimulated.

Some of the more noteworthy methods of funding new or expanded housing and social programs include restricting mortgage interest deductions for high income homeowners; limiting the tax exclusion for interest on certain state and housing bonds; reducing the deferral of capital gains on certain home sales; including market value of certain properties for estate tax purposes; and complete taxation of Social Security benefits that exceed lifetime contributions, similar to the federal tax treatment now accorded private pensions. To these we add the conventional suggestion that funding could come from the awesome

military budget, with minimal impact, by eliminating a few weapons systems which will probably never clear the research and development stage, or several stealth bombers, up to five in this instance.

We presume to make no selection here as to which precise approach, or combinations thereof, should be used to fund this modest request, except to note that the $2.77 billion Agenda increases proposed translate into less than one quarter of one cent of every federal outlay dollar. Considering that bargain price tag and the priority need it will address, it is difficult to believe that Congress and the Administration can fail to fashion an acceptable package from the various funding options available.

TABLE VII

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL FUNDS

TO IMPLEMENT PROPOSALS, FY 1990*

(in millions)

Program Proposal	Annual Authorization (increase over presently proposed levels)	1990 Appropriation (increase over presently proposed levels)
A. Correcting the Income Imbalance:		
Increase Minimum Wage	—	—
Earned Income Tax Credit Expansion	575	432
Minimum National Benefit Level	925	694
	1,500	1,126
B. Increasing Opportunities For Employment and Self-Sufficiency:		
JTPA Refocuse on Unskilled/ Disadvantaged	included under D	
Medicaid Expansion	180	135
Unemployment Insurance Improvement	40	30
	220	165
C. Reducing the Affordable Housing Gap		
National Affordable Housing Act	1,000	680
Local Housing Regulatory Reform	1.5	1.5
Preserving/Modernizing Public Housing	200	160
Low Income Housing Tax Credit Changes	—	—
	1,301.5	841.5
D. Expanding McKinney Act Program		
Substance Abuse Services	88	88
Mental Health	48.9	48.9
Job Training	38.3	38.3
Permanent SRO housing	150	150
Supplemental Assistance	15	15
	340.1	340.1

E. Welfare Rerform Implementation		
AFDC special needs payments	48	36
child care payment levels	120	90
Other Regulation Changes	---	--
	168	126
F. Supportive Housing For People With AIDS		
Housing Counselling/Referral	5	3
Emergency Services	15	9
Section 8 certificates	100	60
SRO Moderate Rehabilitation	35	21
Community Residences	135	81
	290	174
TOTALS *	**3,819.6**	**2,772.6**

* Above levels in congressional budget resolutions, adopted at other committee levels (Senate and/or House), or proposed by or receiving some indication of support from the Administration.

APPENDIX A

NOTES AND SOURCES

The major sources used in developing the analysis and recommendations contained in the National Agenda for Addressing Homelessness In 1990 and Beyond are listed under each section head.

A. Correcting The Income Imbalance.

Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey, Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Line (August 1988).

Coalition on Human Needs, How the Poor Would Remedy Poverty (1988).

Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, Background Material and Data on Programs Within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means (March 1989).

Congressional Budget Office, Reducing the Deficit: Spending and Revenue Options, A Report to the Senate and House Committees on the Budget (March 1989).

Ford Foundation, Project on Social Welfare and the American Future, Executive Panel, The Common Good (May 1989).

Levy, Frank, Dollars and Dreams: The Changing American Income Distribution (1987).

B. Increasing Opportunities for Employment and Self-Sufficiency.

Auspos, Patricia, Cave, George, Doolittle, Fred and Hoerz, Gregory, Implementing Jobstart: A Demonstration for School Dropouts in the JTPA System, Manpower Demonstration Research Corp. (June 1989).

Ford Foundation, The Common Good, op. cit.

Ivry, Robert J., testimony on behalf of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corp. before the Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Senate, May 11, 1989.

Levitan, Sar and Shapiro, Isaac, Working But Poor: America's Contradictions (1987).

National Association of Counties, JTPA Update, Vol.15-89 (August 2, 1989).

C. Reducing the Affordable Housing Gap for Low-income Households.

Apgar, William and DiPasquale, Denise, The State of the Nation's Housing, Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University (1989).

Bureau of the Census and U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, American Housing Survey for 1985 (February 1989).

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and Low Income Housing Information Service, A Place to Call Home: The Crisis in Housing for the Poor (April 1989).

Institute for Policy Studies, Working Group on Housing, The Right to Housing: A Blueprint for Housing the Nation (1989).

Low Income Housing Information Service and Dolbeare, Cushing N., Out of Reach: Why Everyday People Can't Find Affordable Housing (September 1989)

Low Income Housing Information Service, Special Memoranda, The Fiscal Year 1990 Budget and Low Income Housing (March 1989), and Summary of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act (August 1989).

Schussheim, Morton, J., The Proposed National Affordable Housing Act: Summary and Evaluation (June 1989).

D. Expanding the Effectiveness of the McKinney Act.

General Accounting Office, U.S. Comptroller General, HUD and FEMA's Progress in Implementing The McKinney Act (May 11, 1989).

The Partnership For The Homeless, Funding to Assist the Homeless (December 1987).

U.S. Conference of Mayors, A Status Report on The Stewart B.

McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (June 1988).

E. Implementing Welfare Reform.

Baird, Douglas, testimony on behalf of the Child Welfare League of America before the Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy of the Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, May 15, 1989.

Ford Foundation, The Common Good, op. cit.

Gueron, Judith, Work Initiatives for Welfare Recipients: Lessons from a Multi-State Experiment, Manpower Demonstration Research Corp. (1986).

Perales, Cesar A., testimony on behalf of APWA National Council of State Human Service Directors before the Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy of the Finance Committee, U.S. Senate, May 15, 1989.

F. Developing a Comprehensive Plan to Provide Supportive Housing for Homeless People with AIDS.

City of San Francisco, Beyond Shelter: A Homeless Plan for San Francisco, Draft for Public Review (August 1989).

Foner, Geoffrey, AIDS and Homelessness, Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, Vol. 20 (April-June 1988).

McDermott, Jim, AIDS Housing Proposals, Summary of Congressman McDermott's Draft Legislation (August 1989).

The Partnership For The Homeless, AIDS - The Cutting Edge of Homelessness in New York City (January 1989).

Presidential Commission on The Human Immunodeficiency Virus Epidemic, Report to the President of the U.S. (June 1988).

Public Health Centers for Disease Control, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report (September 1989).

APPENDIX B

National Survey Questionnaire

INFORMATION SHEET

1. Please indicate your name, and the name, address, and telephone number of the agency (or agencies) for whom you are answering:

Contact Person _____(name)

Name of Agency _____

Address _____

_____

_____

Telephone #:_____

2. What is the nature of your involvement with the homeless:

(Check off)
Public Sector Agency_____ Non-profit coalition (city-wide)___
Neighborhood Coalition___ Provider Agency_____
Religious Agency_____ Shelter operator_____
Advocacy group_____

3. What services does your organization provide for the homeless?

_____

_____

4. Locality: (If the answers to the questionnaire represents an area larger than the city in which you reside, please state--e.g., a metropolitan area, or a county etc.)

_____

5. If your locality is called by any other name (popularly referred to as...), please state this:

Commonly-known name _____

_____

Note: If you need more room than the questionnaire provides space for please attach additional sheets to the back of the questionnaire.

YOUR SPECIFIC ANSWERS AND THEIR SPECIFIC

SOURCES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL

I. THE NEED

1. During the last year did the need for emergency shelter (including temporary hotel placements) in your city or locality
increase _____. By what percentage _____%
decreased _____. By what percentage _____%
stayed about the same_____.

2. Please indicate the percentage breakdown of the total number of homeless in your city or locality into the following categories and indicate the percentage of increase-decrease in each category during the last year. (In answering this question, please assume that there are about 4 family members in each homeless family.)

	% of Total Homeless Population	During the last year this number-		
		Increased	Decreased	Approximate % of change
Single men				
Single Women				
Family members (parents & children)				
Single youth (18 years & under)				

3. There have been several surveys and reports which have varied widely in their general conclusions on what percentages of the homeless are disabled by serious mental illness and drug and/or alcohol dependence. This question is used to help clarify those differences by measuring these disabilities within each of the following subpopulations:

(a) Single Men

What percentage of the single adult homeless men in your city or locality are impaired by the following disabilities:

Severe Mental Illness _____%
Drug and/or Alcohol Dependency _____%

(b) Single Women

What percentage of the single adult homeless women in your city or locality are impaired by the following disabilities:

Severe Mental Illness _____%
Drug and/or Alcohol Dependency _____%

(c) Family Members (Families with children)
What percentage of members of homeless families in your city or locality are impaired by the following disabilities:
*Note: Once again, assume that there are about 4 persons in each family.

Severe Mental Illness_____%
Drug and/or Alcohol Dependency _____%

(d) Single Youths (18 years & under)
What percentage of homeless single youths in your city or locality are impaired by the following disabilities:

Severe Mental Illness_____%
Drug and/or Alcohol Dependency _____%

4. Some cities and localities have recently reported an increase in what may be called the hard-core or chronic homeless (otherwise known as "street people" who have adjusted their lifestyle to living in various shelters or in the streets and who generally resist or reject services or efforts to provide employment, permanent housing and other assistance designed to help escape the cycle of homelessness).
Has this group increased in your city or locality during the last year?

Yes_____ No_____

5. Have the "hidden homeless" (those doubled or tripled up with others, mostly families with children) and those "at risk" of becoming homeless increased-decreased during the last year.
_____Increased, _____decreased or _____stayed the same.

6. Have the number of homeless who are employed either fully or part-time increased in your city or locality during the last year?

Yes_____ No_____
If "yes", how would you characterize this increase:
_____substantial, _____moderate, or _____slight.

7. What is your present best estimate of the percentage of the total homeless population (including families with children) who become or remain homeless by their own choice? _____%

II. THE PRESENT AVAILABILITY OF BEDS AND OTHER ASSISTANCE

1. During the last year, did the number of emergency and transitional shelter beds (including temporary hotel placements) in your city or locality

increase_____ By What percentage _____%
decrease_____ By What percentage _____%
stayed about the same_____

(Note : When answering this question, do not include specialty beds and facilities such as community residences for the mentally disturbed or retarded, or drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs but do include hotel rooms, rooming houses and SRO accommodations under a voucher or similar temporary program).

2. On the following chart, please indicate which services other than emergency shelter are specifically available for homeless people in your city or locality and, if available, whether they meet the need:

	Available to Homeless People?		If Available Able to Meet Need?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Day Centers Singles (including Mentally Ill				
Day Centers Families				
Child Day Care				
Health Care				
Mental Health Care				
Case Management				
Transitional Housing Mentally Ill				
Transitional Housing Families				
Housing Assistance				
Job Training				
Drug Rehab Programs				
Counseling				

Other (specify)_____

_____

III. THE GAP IN SERVICES TO MEET THE NEED

1. Were people turned away in your city or locality from emergency shelters or transitional accommodations (hotels, rooming houses or SRO's) this last year because of unavailability of beds and/or space?

Yes_____ No_____

2. Please give your best estimate of the need in your city or locality for emergency shelter and transitional accommodations which was unmet during this last year.

_____%

3. If you can, please break down the percentage of unmet need in your city or locality for emergency shelter and transitional accommodations during this last year, as follows:

single adults _____%
families with children _____%
unaccompanied youth _____%

4. From the following list of groups of homeless people, please rank ("1", "2" and "3") the top three groups for which emergency shelter, transitional accommodations or other needed services were most lacking during the past year in your city or locality:

Rank (1, 2, and 3)

Children----------
Mentally Ill----------
People with AIDS---------
Physically Challenged----
Single Parent Mothers----
Substance Abusers--------
Unaccompanied Teenagers--
Unemployed----------
Working poor----------

IV. CAUSES OF HOMELESSNESS

1. What do you consider to be the principal cause of homelessness in your city or locality at this time?

_____

_____ _____

2. Among the following recognized causes of homelessness, please rank the top three (1,2, and 3) causes for additional people becoming homeless in your city or locality during the last year.

Cause	Rank
AIDS and AIDS-related illnesses	
Domestic Violence/Family Disintegration	
Lack of Education and/or Job Skills	
Lack of Affordable and decent housing	
Minimum and other Wage Levels	
Mental Illness	
Public Assistance Deficiencies	
Physical Impediments	
Substance Abuse	
Unemployment	
Other: _____	

V. **THE COMING YEAR**

1. During the coming year, do you expect the demand for emergency shelter and transitional accommodations in your city or locality to_____increase, _____decrease or _____stay about the same?

If you expect an increase in need, we will assume that the causes for such increase are the same as you indicated in your answers to Section IV, unless otherwise specified here:

_____

_____

2. If you expect the demand to <u>decrease or stay the same</u> please indicate the reasons (check as many as you consider applicable):

More affordable housing being provided for homeless and low-income households----------
More jobs available for homeless and low income people-----
The impact of Economic Recovery----------
Programs designed to prevent homelessness----------
Increases in public benefit levels and/or better administration of benefit programs----------
More programs and services available for mentally disabled----------
More effective programs for victims of drug and/or alcohol abuse----------
Other (explain):

_____

_____

3. In the coming year, do you expect the number of homeless who cannot be provided emergency shelter or transitional accommodations on any particular night to _____increase, _____ decrease or
_____stay about the same.
If you expect an increase, please indicate on what level:

substantial-------
moderate----------
slight------------

4. In the coming year, do you expect available emergency shelter and transitional accommodations in your city or locality to _____ increase, _____decrease or _____stay about the same.
If you expect an increase, please indicate on what level:

substantial--------
moderate-----------
slight--------------

5. What impact on the problem of homelessness do you anticipate in your city or locality as a result of the recently enacted federal Welfare Reform legislation <u>in the coming year?</u>

Almost none----------
Almost none, except some for childless couples----------
Slight----------
Slight, except some for childless couples----------
Moderate----------
Substantial----------
Other_____

_____

6. What are your concerns about the eventual or long-term impact of Welfare Reform on the problem of homelessness in your city or locality?(check as many as apply)

Insufficient federal funding----------

Local commitment (state, county, city) is uncertain---------

Welfare reform will not provide more jobs
at adequate wage levels----------

"Workfare" is unfair without meaningful jobs
at adequate wage levels----------

Welfare reform won't have substantial impact on homelessness
without more affordable housing----------

Welfare reform won't work until basic benefits are raised to
the poverty level----------
Other_____

_____

VI. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

1. Is there a shortage of affordable housing for low income people in your city or locality?

Yes----------
No----------

2. During the past year, did this shortage -----increase, -----decrease or -----stay about the same?

3. If the shortage increased, which of the following best describes that increase:

substantial-------
moderate----------
slight------------

4. Please rank the three major causes of this affordable housing shortage in your city or locality (Rank (1, 2 and 3 only)

Lack of replacement of affordable housing lost ---
Curtailment of government housing programs--------
Massive Urban business redevelopment--------------
Conversions (particularly SRO's)------------------
Landlord neglect or abandonment-------------------
Deterioration or Fire-----------------------------
Gentrification------------------------------------
Rent Increases------------------------------------
Other (Specify)-----------------------------------

5. Do you consider this shortage in affordable housing, particularly for low-income people, to be a major cause of homelessness in your city or locality?

Yes---------
No----------

6. Are there now any locally-designed housing programs or firm commitments for such programs in the coming year to produce more affordable housing for low-income households?

Yes--------
No---------

If "yes", do these affordable low-income housing programs or commitments include permanent housing for the homeless?

Yes--------
No---------

7. Will any such local affordable housing initiatives be able to meet the housing needs of the low-income and homeless people in our city or locality without a substantial increase in federal funding?

Yes-------
No--------

8. Recently, several Bills have been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives designed to get the federal government back into the business of assisting the provision of affordable housing for low-income households and the homeless. The "Affordable Housing Act" would provide $75 billion over five years for the new construction, rehabilitation and acquisition of 7,500,000 affordable housing units for low-income households as well as continuing financial assistance to maintain these units. Capital grants would require a 20% match and the program would be funded by increases in the alternative minimum tax,certain inheritance taxes, and excise taxes on tobacco products. Do you support this Bill?

Yes-------
No--------

If "yes", would you support this Bill as an alternative to simply increasing funding under the existing Section 8 programs for assisting the production of low-income housing to 1981 funding levels?

Yes-------
No--------

9. At least one major national organization representing private home builders and construction companies is considering ways to assist in addressing homelessness and the lack of affordable housing for low-income people. Do you feel that involvement by affiliates and/or members of such organizations in your city or locality would contribute substantially to any private-public sector effort to address the lack of affordable low-income housing?

Yes-------
No--------

VII. STREET SOLICITATION (PANHANDLING)

The matter of more people engaging in street solicitation ("panhandling") has received considerable media attention lately.

1. Do you estimate that there are -----more,-----less, or ------just about the same number of people involved in street solicitation in your city or locality now as there was last year?

2. In the coming year, do you expect the number of so-called panhandlers in your city or locality to -----increase, ----- decrease,------or stay about the same?

3. If you estimated that the numbers of so-called panhandlers in your city or locality have increased over the last year, which of the following best describes the reasons for the largest portion of such increase: (check one or more)

increase in numbers belonging to the permanent underclass--
low level of benefits and/or public assistance failures----
worsening of affordable housing shortage----------
unemployment and/or underemployment----------
more "working poor"----------
more "con artists"----------
more who prefer panhandling than getting a job or qualifying for public assistance and using whatever programs are available to serve the homeless and the poor----------
Other (Specify)_____

_____

4. Which of the following statements about so-called panhandlers do you agree with? (Check one or more):

People should encourage them to go to shelters and soup kitchens rather than give them money.----------
People should not give to them because many are either "con artists" or don't need the money.----------
People should decide whether to give to them based upon their own personal judgments.----------
People who continue giving to them should also encourage them to use available shelter, emergency services, benefits and other programs.----------

Other: _____

VIII. Homeless People With AIDS

Many cities have already reported growing numbers of People With AIDS and AIDS-Related Complex (PWA-ARCs) among their homeless populations.

1. Please check-off one of the following which best indicates the extent of the PWA-ARC homeless population in your city or locality:

Substantial and increasing----------
Moderate----------
Moderate & Increasing----------
Small----------
Small but increasing----------
None----------

2. Do you anticipate that in the coming year the PWA-ARC homeless population will _____increase, _____decrease, _____or stay about the same?

3. Which of the following (check-off one) best describes the housing and care facilities available in your city or locality to meet the needs of PWA-ARC homeless?

Sufficient----------
Insufficient----------
Almost Non-existent----------

If your answer was "insufficient" or "almost non-existent", do you feel that negative attitudes of public officials towards the principal risk groups (homosexuals and intravenous drug users) is a factor?

Yes------
No-------

4. Are there any firm plans or commitments to establish housing-care facilities in your city or locality to meet the needs of PWA-ARc homeless?

Yes-------
No--------

If "yes", will these housing-care facilities when established be sufficient to meet the needs in your city or locality of the existing and projected PWA-ARC homeless?

Yes------
No-------

5. The McKinney Act does not presently include specific funding for projects to provide emergency housing-care facilities (enhanced shelter) for PWA-ARCs. Do you think it should?

Yes-----
No------

IX. THE MCKINNEY ACT

This Section is designed to elicit specific comments and suggestions concerning the structure and administration of the McKinney Act as it may affect your efforts and those of other agencies in your city or locality to address the needs of the homeless.

1. Do you feel that the most recent Comprehensive Homeless Assistance Plan (CHAP) submitted for your city or area pursuant to the Act was adequately designed and structured to efficiently assist the homeless in your city or area?

Yes -----
No ------

2. If your answer to the above was "no", please indicate the reasons (check one or more):

(a) Insufficient consultation with agencies and groups providing assistance to the homeless. -----
(b) Not enough time to design the CHAP.----------
(c) Our CHAP did not submit for some of the available programs.----------
(d) Other (please explain)._____

_____

3. If your city or locality did not submit a CHAP for the initial funding under the McKinney Act, or the CHAP did not include funding for some of the programs specified, what was the reason? (check one or more)

(a) Not enough time. ----------
(b) Inadequate local leadership. --------
(c) No interest in any of the programs provided under the Act. ----------
(d) Programs provided under the Act not properly structured or funded. ----------
(e) Programs not relevant to our city or area (e.g., churches and synagogues excluded). ----------
(f) Not enough capability of agencies in our city or area to operate programs under Act. ----------
(g) Not enough local funds available to combine or match with McKinney funds to properly operate programs specified. ----------
(h) Other (please explain)._____

_____

4. How much additional capacity for shelter, transitional accommodations and other emergency services has the McKinney Act funding provided to date in your city or locality (check one)?

No funding requested -----
No funding received -----
No effect yet -----
5-10% -----
10-20% -----
20-30% -----
30-40% -----
40-50% -----
50-70% -----
70-100% -----

5. Do you expect the McKinney Act funding to have a greater impact in your city or locality during the coming year?

Yes-----
No------

6. If you have found that the funding and/or the programs provided for under the McKinney Act have lacked effectiveness in addressing the needs of the homeless in your city or locality, please indicate the cause or causes of such ineffectiveness (check one or more):

(a) Insufficient funding ----------
(b) Improperly structured funding -----
(c) Inadequate level of funding -------
(d) Inadequately structured programs --
(e) Ineffective administration of programs by federal agencies ----------
(f) Ineffective administration of programs by State, County or City agencies --
(g) Other (please explain)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. If you have had any dealing with any of the federal agencies charged with administering or coordinating the funding and programs under the McKinney Act, please rate their performance:

(a) HUD	good -----
	fair -----
	poor -----
(b) HHS	good -----
	fair -----
	poor -----
(c) Dept. of Defense	good -----
	fair -----
	poor -----
(d) Veterans Administration	good -----
	fair -----
	poor -----
(e) Dept. of Agriculture	good -----
	fair -----
	poor -----
(f) FEMA	good -----
	fair -----
	poor -----
(g) Dept. of Education	good -----
	fair -----
	poor -----
(h) Dept. of Labor	good -----
	fair -----
	poor -----
(i) Interagency Council on the Homeless	good -----
	fair -----
	poor -----

8. What is your most important recommendation to improve the effectiveness and impact of the funding and programs provided for under the McKinney Act?

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

The following is information provided from "Out of Reach: Why Everyday People Can't Find Affordable Housing", issued September, 1989 by the Low Income Housing Information Service and prepared by Cushing N. Dolbeare.

The Table reproduced provides,for each metropolitan area as well as statewide averages for renters in metropolitan areas, the estimated proportion of renter households unable to afford federal fair market rents (FMRs) for one and two bedroom units at 30 percent of income.

Reproduced through the courtesy of the Low Income Housing Information Service, 1012 14th St. NW, # 1500 Washington, DC 20005

Table 1: Unfair Market Rents

(Estimated Percentage of Renter Households Unable to Pay one- and Two-Bedroom Fair Market Rents, by State or Metropolitan Area, 1989)

State (Rank*)/SMSA	Median Renter Income	HUD FMRs 1 BR	HUD FMRs 2 BR	Percent unable to pay 1 BR	Percent unable to pay 2 BR
ALABAMA (28)	$15,300	$320	$370	43%	49%
Anniston, AL	$13,600	$281	$330	42%	49%
Birmingham, AL	$16,000	$315	$370	40%	47%
Columbus, GA-AL	$16,200	$289	$342	37%	43%
Florence, AL	$13,200	$299	$353	46%	53%
Gadsden, AL	$12,100	$259	$306	44%	51%
Huntsville, AL	$18,200	$330	$389	37%	44%
Mobile, AL	$15,000	$342	$401	46%	53%
Montgomery, AL	$15,600	$304	$357	40%	46%
Tuscaloosa, AL	$11,800	$318	$375	53%	61%
ALASKA (49)	$29,800	$490	$580	34%	40%
Anchorage, AK	$29,800	$489	$576	34%	40%
ARIZONA (7)	$19,700	$460	$550	47%	55%
Phoenix, AZ	$20,800	$470	$554	46%	53%
Tucson, AZ	$17,200	$450	$529	52%	60%
ARKANSAS (35)	$16,900	$330	$390	40%	47%
Fayetteville-Springdale,AR	$16,300	$308	$363	39%	45%
Fort Smith, AR-OK	$15,500	$300	$353	40%	46%
Little Rock-North LR, AR	$18,700	$356	$419	39%	46%
Memphis, TN-AR	$15,200	$345	$405	46%	53%
Pine Bluff, AR	$13,700	$297	$350	44%	51%
Texarkana, AR	$16,400	$296	$349	37%	43%
CALIFORNIA (3)	$23,200	$590	$690	51%	58%
Anaheim/Santa Ana, CA	$29,700	$671	$790	46%	53%
Bakersfield, CA	$19,700	$458	$540	47%	54%
Chico, CA	$14,700	$403	$474	54%	62%
Fresno, CA	$18,400	$419	$493	46%	53%
Los Angeles, CA	$22,500	$588	$684	52%	59%
Modesto, CA	$19,100	$440	$519	47%	54%
Oxnard/Ventura, CA	$25,600	$574	$675	46%	52%
Redding, CA	$17,100	$419	$493	49%	56%
Riverside/San Bernardino, CA	$18,700	$473	$552	51%	58%
Sacramento, CA	$18,900	$434	$519	47%	54%
Salinas-Seaside-Monterey, CA	$23,700	$502	$589	43%	50%
San Diego, CA	$21,800	$552	$647	51%	58%
San Francisco, CA	$25,000	$716	$848	56%	64%
San Jose, CA	$31,500	$715	$840	46%	53%
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, CA	$25,800	$567	$668	45%	52%
Santa Cruz, CA	$22,300	$641	$756	56%	64%
Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	$22,800	$564	$665	50%	57%
Stockton, CA	$18,000	$386	$455	44%	50%
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA	$22,300	$493	$580	45%	52%
Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA	$16,900	$391	$460	47%	54%
Yuba City, CA	$15,800	$346	$407	45%	51%

* States are ranked from 1 (least affordable) to 50 (most affordable)

State (Rank)/SMSA	Median Renter Income	HUD FMRs 1 BR	HUD FMRs 2 BR	Percent unable to pay 1 BR	Percent unable to pay 2 BR
COLORADO (36)	$21,300	$410	$490	40%	47%
Colorado Springs, CO	$19,600	$372	$439	39%	46%
Denver, CO	$22,600	$426	$502	39%	45%
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	$20,000	$430	$505	44%	50%
Greeley, CO	$17,500	$371	$437	43%	50%
Pueblo, CO	$11,900	$369	$435	60%	69%
CONNECTICUT (21)	$25,000	$530	$620	43%	50%
Bridgeport-Milford, CT	$24,000	$515	$606	44%	50%
Bristol, CT	$26,600	$427	$503	34%	39%
Danbury, CT	$29,900	$559	$658	39%	45%
Hartford, CT	$24,800	$516	$603	43%	49%
New Britain, CT	$24,900	$458	$539	38%	44%
New Haven-Meriden, CT	$21,400	$555	$653	52%	59%
New London-Norwich, CT	$24,800	$493	$579	41%	47%
Norwalk, CT	$32,000	$594	$699	38%	45%
Stamford, CT	$33,800	$716	$843	43%	50%
Waterbury, CT	$22,300	$445	$524	41%	47%
DELAWARE (11)	$20,500	$460	$540	46%	52%
Wilmington, DE	$20,500	$455	$541	45%	52%
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA*	$29,600	$570	$670	40%	46%
Washington, DC-VA-MD	$29,600	$570	$670	40%	46%
FLORIDA (19)	$19,400	$410	$480	43%	50%
Bradenton, FL	$19,200	$416	$490	44%	51%
Daytona Beach, FL	$16,500	$401	$472	49%	56%
Fort Lauderdale, FL	$23,100	$450	$530	40%	47%
Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL	$21,500	$427	$502	41%	47%
Fort Walton Beach, FL	$19,000	$285	$335	31%	36%
Gainesville, FL	$14,700	$362	$426	49%	57%
Jacksonville, FL	$19,100	$378	$446	41%	47%
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	$17,100	$342	$402	41%	47%
Melbourne-Titusville, FL	$20,300	$386	$455	39%	46%
Miami-Hialeah, FL	$18,600	$452	$529	49%	56%
Ocala, FL	$16,600	$316	$371	39%	45%
Orlando, FL	$21,100	$419	$492	41%	47%
Panama City, FL	$17,200	$304	$358	37%	43%
Pensacola, FL	$17,600	$340	$399	40%	46%
Sarasota, FL	$20,900	$450	$530	44%	51%
Tallahassee, FL	$15,100	$356	$420	48%	55%
Tampa-St. Petersburg, FL	$18,300	$374	$440	42%	48%
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL	$23,300	$429	$499	38%	44%
GEORGIA (34)	$20,300	$400	$470	40%	47%
Albany, GA	$18,500	$311	$368	35%	41%
Athens, GA	$15,400	$325	$382	43%	50%
Atlanta, GA	$22,300	$451	$529	41%	48%
Augusta, GA	$17,600	$327	$382	38%	44%
Chattanooga, TN-GA	$14,900	$351	$413	48%	55%
Columbus, GA	$16,200	$289	$342	37%	43%
Macon-Warner Robins, GA	$17,700	$327	$386	38%	44%
Savannah, GA	$16,400	$330	$389	41%	48%

*District of Columbia would be ranked 39, if counted.

State (Rank)/SMSA	Median Renter Income	HUD FMRs 1 BR	HUD FMRs 2 BR	Percent unable to pay 1 BR	Percent unable to pay 2 BR
HAWAII (12)	$23,600	$530	$620	46%	52%
Honolulu, HI	$23,600	$527	$619	45%	52%
IDAHO (9)	$18,900	$430	$510	46%	53%
Boise City, ID	$18,900	$433	$510	46%	53%
ILLINOIS (23)	$22,800	$480	$560	43%	49%
Bloomington-Normal, IL	$18,900	$372	$437	40%	47%
Champaign-Urbana, IL	$18,600	$360	$425	40%	46%
Chicago, IL	$23,400	$496	$580	43%	50%
Davenport-Rock Island, IL	$19,300	$396	$466	42%	49%
Decatur, IL	$20,400	$360	$425	37%	43%
Kankakee, IL	$18,000	$356	$420	41%	47%
Peoria, IL	$20,100	$418	$491	43%	49%
Rockford, IL	$20,500	$380	$447	38%	44%
Springfield, IL	$19,400	$381	$448	40%	47%
St. Louis, MO-IL	$20,300	$378	$445	38%	45%
INDIANA (41)	$18,800	$350	$410	38%	44%
Anderson, IN	$18,300	$310	$363	35%	41%
Bloomington, IN	$14,700	$334	$393	46%	53%
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	$18,700	$329	$388	36%	42%
Elkhart-Goshen, IN	$21,000	$325	$384	32%	38%
Evansville, IN	$18,300	$336	$394	38%	44%
Fort Wayne, IN	$19,000	$341	$397	37%	43%
Gary-Hammond, IN	$20,400	$402	$473	40%	47%
Indianapolis, IN	$20,700	$350	$410	35%	41%
Kokomo, IN	$20,800	$342	$400	34%	40%
Lafayette-West Lafayette, IN	$17,100	$360	$424	43%	50%
Louisville, KY-IN	$15,700	$312	$366	41%	47%
Muncie, IN	$15,700	$294	$346	39%	45%
South Bend-Mishawaka, IN	$18,000	$335	$391	38%	44%
Terre Haute, IN	$17,900	$306	$357	36%	41%
IOWA (33)	$19,400	$380	$450	40%	47%
Cedar Rapids, IA	$21,000	$383	$451	38%	44%
Davenport-Rock Island, IL-IA	$19,300	$396	$466	42%	49%
Des Moines, IA	$20,700	$382	$450	38%	44%
Dubuque, IA	$16,700	$354	$417	43%	50%
Iowa City, IA	$18,000	$404	$475	46%	52%
Omaha, NE-IA	$20,300	$349	$411	36%	42%
Sioux City, IA	$17,200	$346	$406	41%	48%
Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	$18,000	$384	$453	44%	50%
KANSAS (45)	$21,300	$370	$440	36%	42%
Kansas City, MO-KS	$21,000	$368	$433	36%	42%
Lawrence, KS	$14,200	$387	$456	54%	62%
Topeka, KS	$19,000	$352	$413	38%	44%
Wichita, KS	$24,100	$374	$445	33%	38%
KENTUCKY (31)	$16,600	$330	$390	41%	47%
Cincinnati, OH-IN-KY	$18,700	$329	$388	36%	42%
Clarksville-Hopkinsville, TN-KY	$15,000	$336	$421	46%	55%
Evansville, IN-KY	$18,300	$336	$394	38%	44%
Huntington-Ashland, KY	$15,200	$347	$409	46%	53%

State (Rank)/SMSA	Median Renter Income	HUD FMRs 1 BR	HUD FMRs 2 BR	Percent unable to pay 1 BR	Percent unable to pay 2 BR
Lexington-Fayette, KY	$16,300	$363	$427	45%	52%
Louisville, KY	$15,700	$312	$366	41%	47%
Owensboro, KY	$14,800	$284	$335	39%	46%
LOUISIANA (16)	$18,400	$390	$460	43%	50%
Alexandria, LA	$16,300	$306	$361	39%	45%
Baton Rouge, LA	$17,000	$384	$452	46%	53%
Lafayette, LA	$22,400	$384	$452	36%	41%
Lake Charles, LA	$19,800	$307	$359	32%	37%
Monroe, LA	$13,600	$305	$359	46%	52%
New Orleans, LA	$18,900	$424	$499	46%	52%
Shreveport, LA	$17,800	$346	$409	40%	47%
MAINE (2)	$17,500	$440	$540	50%	60%
Bangor, ME	$16,900	$381	$447	46%	52%
Lewiston-Auburn,ME	$15,500	$392	$443	51%	56%
Portland, ME	$18,700	$489	$618	52%	63%
MARYLAND (32)	$24,000	$480	$560	41%	47%
Baltimore, MD	$21,300	$432	$506	42%	48%
Cumberland, MD	$14,800	$312	$365	43%	49%
Hagerstown, MD	$21,800	$356	$420	34%	40%
Wilmington, DE-NJ-MD	$20,500	$455	$541	45%	52%
Washington, DC-VA-MD	$29,600	$570	$671	40%	46%
MASSACHUSETTS (1)	$22,700	$600	$710	52%	61%
Boston, MA	$24,800	$681	$803	54%	62%
Brockton, MA	$19,800	$505	$633	51%	62%
Fall River, MA	$18,000	$436	$524	49%	57%
Fitchburg-Leominster, MA	$19,200	$485	$572	50%	58%
Lawrence-Haverhill, MA	$22,400	$544	$652	49%	57%
Lowell, MA	$23,300	$523	$610	46%	52%
New Bedford, MA	$16,500	$419	$496	51%	59%
Pittsfield, MA	$18,100	$449	$525	50%	57%
Springfield, MA	$18,300	$468	$551	51%	59%
Worcester, MA	$20,800	$472	$553	46%	53%
MICHIGAN (30)	$20,400	$410	$480	41%	48%
Ann Arbor, MI	$22,500	$479	$565	43%	50%
Battle Creek, MI	$17,700	$332	$378	39%	44%
Benton Harbor, MI	$17,200	$359	$420	43%	49%
Detroit, MI	$20,600	$441	$514	44%	50%
Flint, MI	$21,700	$339	$401	33%	38%
Grand Rapids, MI	$20,800	$384	$450	38%	44%
Jackson, MI	$18,400	$353	$416	39%	46%
Kalamazoo, MI	$19,000	$366	$430	40%	46%
Lansing-East Lansing, MI	$20,900	$382	$448	38%	44%
Muskegon, MI	$15,500	$314	$371	41%	48%
Saginaw-Bay City-Midland, MI	$17,900	$347	$408	40%	46%
MINNESOTA (25)	$20,900	$430	$510	42%	49%
Duluth, MN-WI	$12,600	$352	$415	55%	63%
Fargo-Moorhead, ND-MN	$17,500	$360	$423	42%	49%
Minneapolis-St. Paul, WI-MN	$21,800	$445	$528	42%	49%
Rochester, MN	$21,600	$380	$448	36%	42%
St. Cloud, MN	$18,600	$363	$427	40%	47%

State (Rank)/SMSA	Median Renter Income	HUD FMRs 1 BR	HUD FMRs 2 BR	Percent unable to pay 1 BR	Percent unable to pay 2 BR
MISSISSIPPI (17)	$16,500	$350	$410	43%	50%
Biloxi-Gulfport, MS	$16,000	$304	$358	39%	46%
Jackson, MS	$16,100	$385	$454	48%	55%
Memphis, TN-MS	$15,200	$345	$405	46%	53%
Pascagoula, MS	$19,700	$330	$388	35%	40%
MISSOURI (42)	$19,900	$360	$430	37%	44%
Columbia, MO	$18,000	$351	$415	40%	47%
Joplin, MO	$15,100	$272	$320	37%	43%
Kansas City, KS-MO	$21,000	$368	$433	36%	42%
St. Joseph, MO	$16,500	$288	$340	36%	42%
St. Louis, IL-MO	$20,300	$378	$445	38%	45%
Springfield, MO	$16,200	$303	$356	39%	45%
MONTANA (14)	$17,500	$390	$450	45%	51%
Billings, MT	$18,100	$407	$479	46%	53%
Great Falls, MT	$16,800	$359	$424	44%	50%
NEBRASKA (47)	$20,000	$350	$410	36%	42%
Lincoln, NE	$19,600	$356	$419	38%	44%
Omaha, NE	$20,300	$349	$411	36%	41%
Sioux City, NE	$17,200	$346	$408	41%	48%
NEVADA (4)	$21,600	$540	$640	50%	58%
Las Vegas, NV	$20,300	$506	$596	50%	57%
Reno, NV	$24,300	$624	$736	51%	59%
NEW HAMPSHIRE (20)	$24,200	$510	$600	43%	50%
Manchester, NH	$23,600	$484	$589	42%	50%
Nashua, NH	$28,900	$545	$642	39%	45%
Portsmouth-Dover, NH	$22,000	$503	$590	46%	53%
NEW JERSEY (8)	$21,800	$500	$590	47%	54%
Allentown-Bethlehem, PA-NJ	$20,100	$385	$450	39%	46%
Atlantic City, NJ	$19,300	$463	$543	48%	55%
Jersey City, NJ	$21,000	$461	$542	45%	51%
Newark, NJ	$23,200	$539	$634	47%	54%
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	$20,000	$435	$511	44%	51%
Trenton, NJ	$22,800	$551	$649	49%	56%
Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ	$17,200	$442	$520	51%	59%
Wilmington, DE-NJ	$20,500	$455	$541	45%	52%
NEW MEXICO (10)	$18,200	$410	$480	46%	52%
Albuquerque, NM	$18,800	$419	$492	45%	52%
Las Cruces, NM	$14,800	$332	$391	46%	52%
NEW YORK (24)	$22,900	$470	$560	42%	49%
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	$18,600	$389	$459	43%	49%
Binghamton, NY	$19,900	$351	$415	37%	43%
Buffalo, NY	$17,200	$359	$423	43%	49%
Elmira, NY	$16,200	$359	$423	45%	52%
Glens Falls, NY	$18,000	$371	$436	42%	49%
Nassau-Suffolk, NY	$26,700	$640	$753	48%	55%
New York, NY	$23,600	$481	$566	42%	48%
Poughkeepsie, NY	$24,500	$538	$634	45%	51%
Rochester, NY	$20,800	$425	$500	42%	48%
Syracuse, NY	$20,200	$366	$429	37%	43%
Utica-Rome, NY	$16,300	$340	$400	43%	49%

State (Rank)/SMSA	Median Renter Income	HUD FMRs 1 BR	HUD FMRs 2 BR	Percent unable to pay 1 BR	Percent unable to pay 2 BR
NORTH CAROLINA (48)	$20,300	$340	$400	35%	40%
Asheville, NC	$17,300	$314	$370	37%	44%
Burlington, NC	$19,600	$379	$446	40%	46%
Charlotte-Rock Hill, NC-SC	$21,800	$347	$407	33%	39%
Fayetteville, NC	$18,800	$299	$353	33%	39%
Greensboro-Winston-Salem,NC	$20,200	$328	$385	34%	39%
Hickory, NC	$20,400	$286	$337	29%	34%
Jacksonville, NC	$16,400	$298	$351	38%	44%
Raleigh-Durham, NC	$22,200	$376	$443	35%	41%
Wilmington, NC	$15,400	$314	$370	42%	48%
NORTH DAKOTA (29)	$17,400	$350	$420	41%	49%
Bismarck, ND	$19,000	$360	$424	39%	45%
Fargo-Moorhead, MN-ND	$17,500	$360	$423	42%	49%
Grand Forks, ND	$16,500	$342	$404	42%	49%
OHIO (43)	$18,800	$340	$400	37%	43%
Akron, OH	$19,400	$353	$416	38%	44%
Canton, OH	$17,700	$312	$367	36%	42%
Cincinnati, KY-IN-OH	$18,700	$329	$388	36%	42%
Cleveland, OH	$19,400	$335	$395	36%	42%
Columbus, OH	$19,400	$352	$418	37%	44%
Dayton-Springfield, OH	$18,600	$331	$385	37%	43%
Hamilton-Middletown, OH	$17,700	$368	$433	43%	49%
Huntington, WV-OH	$15,200	$347	$409	46%	53%
Lima, OH	$19,400	$331	$389	35%	41%
Lorain-Elyria, OH	$20,500	$348	$410	35%	41%
Mansfield, OH	$16,700	$301	$352	37%	43%
Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH	$18,400	$325	$383	37%	43%
Steubenville-Wierton, WV-OH	$16,600	$335	$392	41%	48%
Toledo, OH	$18,900	$380	$448	41%	48%
Wheeling, WV-OH	$14,500	$327	$386	46%	53%
Youngstown-Warren, OH	$17,000	$331	$389	40%	46%
OKLAHOMA (37)	$19,700	$380	$450	40%	46%
Enid, OK	$19,200	$361	$425	39%	45%
Fort Smith, AR-OK	$15,500	$300	$353	40%	46%
Lawton, OK	$19,100	$310	$366	34%	39%
Oklahoma City, OK	$20,100	$387	$455	40%	46%
Tulsa, OK	$19,500	$392	$462	41%	48%
OREGON (22)	$19,500	$390	$480	41%	49%
Eugene-Springfield, OR	$16,200	$442	$521	54%	62%
Medford, OR	$16,800	$439	$517	52%	60%
Portland, OR	$21,000	$376	$468	37%	45%
Salem, OR	$17,000	$414	$487	49%	56%
PENNSYLVANIA (26)	$19,400	$400	$470	42%	49%
Allentown-Bethlehem, NJ-PA	$20,100	$385	$450	39%	46%
Altoona, PA	$15,800	$342	$403	44%	51%
Erie, PA	$17,900	$394	$463	45%	51%
Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle, PA	$22,200	$403	$476	37%	44%
Johnstown, PA	$15,800	$333	$391	43%	50%
Lancaster, Pa	$21,800	$412	$484	39%	45%
Philadelphia, NJ-PA	$20,000	$435	$511	44%	51%
Pittsburgh, PA	$18,700	$371	$436	41%	47%

State (Rank)/SMSA	Median Renter Income	HUD FMRs 1 BR	HUD FMRs 2 BR	Percent unable to pay 1 BR	Percent unable to pay 2 BR
Reading, PA	$20,500	$386	$453	39%	45%
Scranton-Wilkesbarre, PA	$17,200	$317	$369	38%	44%
Sharon, PA	$16,400	$364	$430	45%	52%
State College, PA	$16,300	$440	$519	53%	61%
Williamsport, PA	$17,200	$333	$391	40%	46%
York, PA	$20,400	$371	$436	38%	44%
RHODE ISLAND (6)	$18,800	$470	$550	50%	57%
Providence, RI	$18,800	$470	$553	50%	57%
SOUTH CAROLINA (46)	$19,000	$330	$390	36%	42%
Anderson, SC	$16,000	$284	$333	37%	43%
Augusta, GA-SC	$17,600	$327	$382	38%	44%
Charleston, SC	$19,600	$352	$415	37%	43%
Charlotte-Rock Hill NC-SC	$21,800	$347	$407	33%	39%
Columbia, SC	$20,400	$356	$420	36%	42%
Florence, SC	$15,900	$288	$340	37%	44%
Greenville-Spartanburg, SC	$18,400	$310	$366	35%	41%
SOUTH DAKOTA (27)	$16,900	$350	$410	42%	49%
Sioux Falls, SD	$16,900	$346	$407	42%	48%
TENNESSEE (13)	$15,900	$350	$410	45%	51%
Chattanooga, TN	$14,900	$351	$413	48%	55%
Clarksville-Hopkinsville, TN-KY	$15,000	$336	$421	46%	55%
Johnson City-Kingsport, TN	$14,400	$294	$346	42%	48%
Knoxville, TN	$14,900	$325	$381	44%	51%
Memphis, TN-AR-MS	$15,200	$345	$405	46%	53%
Nashville, TN	$18,200	$386	$454	43%	50%
TEXAS (50)	$22,100	$350	$410	33%	38%
Abilene, TX	$18,200	$351	$413	40%	46%
Amarillo, TX	$20,800	$323	$381	33%	38%
Austin, TX	$20,700	$409	$482	41%	47%
Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	$19,800	$371	$437	39%	45%
Brownsville-Harlingen, TX	$13,600	$329	$387	49%	56%
Bryan-College Sation, TX	$15,000	$437	$513	57%	64%
Corpus Christi, TX	$18,900	$380	$447	41%	48%
Dallas, TX	$23,800	$359	$421	32%	37%
El Paso, TX	$15,400	$324	$382	43%	50%
Galveston-Texas City, TX	$20,700	$346	$407	35%	40%
Houston, TX	$26,400	$330	$388	26%	31%
Killeen-Temple, TX	$18,100	$320	$377	37%	43%
Laredo, TX	$13,100	$304	$356	47%	54%
Longview-Marshall, TX	$18,900	$366	$431	40%	46%
Lubbock, TX	$18,000	$281	$368	33%	42%
McAllen-Edinburg, TX	$12,900	$328	$385	51%	58%
Midland, TX	$26,400	$421	$495	33%	39%
Odessa, TX	$21,200	$419	$492	41%	47%
San Angelo, TX	$19,600	$353	$416	37%	43%
San Antonio, TX	$18,300	$354	$420	40%	47%
Sherman-Denison, TX	$19,700	$354	$420	37%	43%
Texarkana, TX-AR	$16,400	$296	$349	37%	43%
Tyler, TX	$21,400	$370	$436	36%	42%
Victoria, TX	$23,300	$451	$531	40%	46%
Waco, TX	$16,200	$302	$354	38%	45%
Wichita Falls, TX	$18,800	$333	$393	37%	43%

State (Rank)/SMSA	Median Renter Income	HUD FMRs 1 BR	HUD FMRs 2 BR	Percent unable to pay 1 BR	Percent unable to pay 2 BR
UTAH (39)	$20,200	$380	$450	39%	45%
Provo-Orem, UT	$16,700	$343	$402	42%	48%
Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT	$21,000	$390	$460	38%	45%
VERMONT (5)	$19,700	$490	$580	50%	58%
Burlington, VT	$19,700	$493	$579	50%	57%
VIRGINIA (38)	$23,400	$450	$530	40%	46%
Charlottesville, VA	$21,400	$408	$479	39%	46%
Danville, VA	$16,400	$311	$366	39%	45%
Johnson City-Kingston-Bristol, VA	$14,400	$294	$346	42%	48%
Lynchburg, VA	$18,900	$343	$395	37%	43%
Norfolk-Virginia Beach, VA	$19,300	$405	$475	43%	49%
Richmond-Petersburg, VA	$21,800	$368	$430	35%	41%
Roanoke, VA	$18,300	$327	$384	37%	43%
Washington, DC-MD-VA	$29,600	$570	$671	40%	46%
WASHINGTON (18)	$18,900	$400	$470	43%	50%
Bellingham, WA	$16,900	$418	$491	50%	57%
Bremerton, WA	$19,700	$420	$493	44%	50%
Olympia, WA	$17,900	$433	$510	49%	56%
Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, WA	$25,400	$490	$576	40%	46%
Seattle, WA	$21,900	$412	$481	39%	45%
Spokane, WA	$15,600	$357	$421	46%	53%
Tacoma, WA	$18,000	$355	$417	40%	47%
Yakima, WA	$16,200	$381	$448	48%	54%
WEST VIRGINIA (15)	$17,100	$360	$430	43%	50%
Charleston, WV	$19,900	$421	$496	43%	50%
Cumberland, WV	$14,800	$312	$365	43%	49%
Huntington,WV	$15,200	$347	$409	46%	53%
Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH	$18,400	$325	$383	37%	43%
Steubenville-Wierton, WV-OH	$16,600	$335	$392	41%	48%
Wheeling, WV	$14,500	$327	$386	46%	53%
WISCONSIN (44)	$20,800	$370	$440	37%	43%
Appleton-Oshkosh-Neenah, WI	$20,700	$328	$385	33%	38%
Duluth, MN-WI	$12,600	$352	$415	55%	63%
Eau Claire, WI	$16,500	$324	$382	40%	47%
Green Bay, WI	$18,900	$328	$387	36%	42%
Janesville-Beloit, WI	$19,300	$361	$425	39%	45%
Kenosha, WI	$23,200	$393	$461	35%	41%
La Crosse, WI	$17,900	$385	$453	44%	51%
Madison, WI	$19,300	$387	$461	40%	47%
Milwaukee, WI	$21,800	$385	$455	37%	43%
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	$21,800	$445	$528	42%	49%
Racine, WI	$21,800	$366	$431	35%	41%
Sheboygan, WI	$19,500	$333	$393	35%	41%
Wausau, WI	$18,200	$326	$385	37%	43%
WYOMING (40)	$25,200	$480	$560	39%	46%
Caspar, WY	$25,200	$480	$563	39%	45%

Source: Federal Register, Vol. 53, No. 183, 9/21/88, pp. 36700-36773, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program; Fair Market Rent Schedules for Use in the Existing Housing Certificate Program, Loan Management and Property Disposition Programs, Moderate Rehabilitation Program and Housing Voucher Program. FMR's effective as of 10/1/88. Renter households unable to afford FMR's derived from U.S. 1980 Census data and HUD income projections. Median renter household income based on 1980 median renter income adjusted by estimated increase in family incomes between 1979 and 1987, projected to 1989. Fair Market Rents are those for year beginning October 1, 1988. Estimated percent unable to afford FMR assumes that distribution of renter income is same as American Housing Survey distribution of metro renter incomes in 1985.